A

REQUEST

TO

Roman Catholicks

To Answer the Queries upon these their following Tenets.

§ I. *Their Divine Service in an Unknown Tongue.*
II. *Their taking away the Cup from the People.*
III. *Their with-holding the Scriptures from the Laicks.*
IV. *The Adoration of Images.*
V. *The Invocation of Saints and Angels.*
VI. *The Doctrine of Merit.*
VII. *Purgatory.*
VIII. *Their Seven Sacraments.*
IX. *Their Priests Intention in Baptism.*
X. *The Limbo of unbaptized Infants.*
XI. *Transubstantiation.*
XII. *The Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass.*
XIII. *Private Masses.*
XIV. *The Sacrament of Penance.*
XV. *The Sacrament of Marriage, with the Clergies Restraint therefrom.*
XVI. *Their Sacrament of extream Unction.*
XVII. *Tradition.*
XXVIII. *That thred-bare Question, Where was your Church before* Luther?
XIX. *The Infallibility of the Pope with his Councils.*
XX. *The Pope's Supremacy.*
XXI. *The Pope's Deposing Power.*
XXII. *Their Uncharitableness to all other Christians.*

James Graden

By a Moderate Son of the Church of *England.*

The Fourth Edition.

London, Printed for *Brab. Aylmer*, at the *Three Pigeons* over against the *Royal Exchange* in *Cornhil*, MDCLXXXVII.

Imprimatur,

Aug. 19*th.*
1687.

Guil. Needham.

A REQUEST TO Roman Catholicks

To Answer the Queries upon these their following Tenets.

§ I. *Their Divine Service in an Unknown Tongue.*
II. *Their taking away the Cup from the People.*
III. *Their with-holding the Scriptures from the Laicks.*
IV. *The Adoration of Images.*
V. *The Invocation of Saints and Angels.*
VI. *The Doctrine of Merit.*
VII. *Purgatory.*
VIII. *Their Seven Sacraments.*
IX. *Their Priests Intention in Baptism.*
X. *The Limbo of unbaptized Infants.*
XI. *Transubstantiation.*
XII. *The Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass.*
XIII. *Private Masses.*
XIV. *The Sacrament of Penance.*
XV. *The Sacrament of Marriage, with the Clergies Restraint therefrom.*
XVI. *Their Sacrament of extream Unction.*
XVII. *Tradition.*
XXVIII. *That thred-bare Question, Where was your Church before* Luther?
XIX. *The Infallibility of the Pope with his Councils.*
XX. *The Pope's Supremacy.*
XXI. *The Pope's Deposing Power.*
XXII. *Their Uncharitableness to all other Christians.*

James Gladen

By a Moderate Son of the Church of *England.*

The Fourth Edition.

London, Printed for *Brab. Aylmer*, at the *Three Pigeons* over against the *Royal Exchange* in *Cornhil*, MDCLXXXVII.

A REQUEST TO Roman Catholicks, &c.

SECTION I.

Their Divine Service in an Unknown Tongue.

Qu. 1. MAY not the Seventh Commandment be as eaſily reconciled to Adultery, as the Service in the Roman Church in an unknown Tongue to 1 *Cor.* 14. where the Apoſtle Five ſeveral Times expreſly prohibits it, and gives ſo many pregnant Reaſons for the Inhibition?

2. If the various Geſtures and Ceremonies practiſed by the Prieſt at Maſs be ſufficient to excite devotion in the Spectators, may not a dumb Prieſt be as uſeful for that effect; eſpecially he who babbles with a Stentorian Voice, as he who ſpeaks in an unknown Language; ſince one who cannot ſpeak at all, may be as mimical as he who can ſpeak more Languages than ever *Joſeph Scaliger* did, or as many as were at the Confuſion of *Babel?*

3. Since it's poſſible that the Prieſt may be ſo Diabolical, as to be practiſing Conjuration in an unknown Language inſtead of Devotion, or may be curſing his Congregation in lieu of bleſſing them; would not Reaſon, without the Apoſtolick Authority, perſuade us of the neceſſity of underſtanding his Langnage, that we may ſay *Amen* to what he ſays?

4. Since the Prieſt in theſe publick Offices is the mouth of the People in offering up their Tribute of Honour and Adoration to God; if the

the Congregation underſtand him not, how can he more juſtifie himſelf, than if he did celebrate the Service in a Tongue himſelf knows nothing of, and which neither the one nor the other did underſtand?

5. Since it's given as the principal Reaſon of the *Roman* Service in Latin (by the *Rhemiſh Annot.*) that Chriſtians where-ever they travel may find the ſame Service and Prieſts officiating in it, as at home; it may be demanded, if for the ſake of ſome few that travel, the many that ſtay at home ſhould be left deſtitute; and for one man's Convenience, a Thouſand be expoſed to eternal Perdition; for there will not be one to a Thouſand who underſtand Latin in the Chriſtian World?

6. Since in the Service in an unknown Tongue the People are wholly left to the Ability and Sincerity of their Prieſt, Is not the caſe of that People very lamentable? For if the Prieſt wants the former, he may through Ignorance turn the moſt Solemn Part of their Service into Ridicule and Nonſenſe, or Blaſphemy: And if he want the later, he may uſe a Spell for Prayer, or the antient charm of the *Valentinians Abracadabra*, for *Ave Maria*; nay, inſtead of Baptizing in the Name of the Father, *&c.* he may do by the Perſon, as a *Jew*, under the Profeſſion of a Prieſt, is ſaid to have done by a certain Man, in this laſt Age, who Baptized him in the horrid Name of the Devil; there being nothing ſo abſurd or wicked, which according to this caſe, may not be practiſed.

7. Since Scripture, the Reaſon of the Thing, the Fathers and Practice of the Church for about Seven Hundred years together, are for the Expedience and Neceſſity of having God's Publick Service in a Tongue, underſtood by the People, may it not juſtly be enquired with what Effrontory the Council of *Trent* hath Anathematized all thoſe who believe the neceſſity of having God's Solemn Worſhip in a known Tongue; as if *Trent*, (becauſe a City of the *Alps*) were transformed into *Mount Ebal*, whence they might curſe that great Doctor of the Gentiles in the firſt place.

8. Is it not evident from 1 *Cor.* 14. that in St. *Paul*'s Judgment they deſerve to be reckoned Mad-men, who Pray to God in an Unknown Tongue?

9. Is it not probable that the Romaniſts have borrowed their Service in an Unknown Tongue, from ſome Heathens? who, (as *Clemens Alexandrinus* reports) thought thoſe Prayers moſt effectual, which were uttered in a barbarous Language; or from their Neighbours, the old *Cuſteans* (of whom *Varro* teſtifies) that their Prieſts did ſcarcely underſtand their own Sacred Rites.

10. Since the *Engliſh* Liturgy is ſo agreeable to the undoubted parts of the moſt antient Liturgies, (it being a Form which hath all thoſe parcels of the Roman Offices that were known and uſed in the firſt Three Centuries, but wants all the Innovaſions and Corruptions of the preſent Maſs) May we not truly and pertinently challenge all Chriſtendom to produce any publick Platform (or Solemn Church-Service) ſo conſtant to the pureſt Primitive Devotions?

11. Since the Famous Biſhop of *Condam* hath moſt cunningly endeavoured a palliative Cure (by ſoft and ſmooth Words) as to many Practices in the Roman Church, which ſtand in need of Amputation, yet both in his Expoſition and Exhortation, he ſtill paſſeth by their Service in an Unknown Tongue; Is it not, becauſe he had no Tongue of his own, to anſwer for that Practice, which is ſo directly repugnant to Scripture and Antiquity, having deſpaired (it ſeems) to find either Butter or Oyl to cicatriſe or ſoften the Wound?

SECT. II.

Their taking away the Cup from the People.

Qu. 1. SInce the Council of *Conſtance*, *Anno* 1418. made it an Article of Faith, That the Laity ought to receive the Euchariſt only in One Kind (*non obſtante* of the Inſtitution of Chriſt, as it was then acknowledged, and the conſtant Practice of the Catholick Church above a thouſand years) Wherefore may they not Chriſten the Laick's Children only in the Name of the Holy Ghoſt, leaving out the Father and the Son by the way of Concomitancy, it being as lawful to Baptize as Communicate by halves, and no leſs certain, that ſince the Three Perſons of the Bleſſed Trinity partake of the ſame individual Nature, where one is, all the reſt muſt be; ſuppoſe the Mutilation of the Euchariſt could not be diſparaged by that Emblem of the Effuſion of Chriſt's Blood, which is neceſſarily required in the Sacrament?

2. Since the principal Reaſon aſſigned by *Gerſon* (for that Canon of the Council of *Conſtance*, which abſtracts the Cup from the People) is the Danger of ſpilling of the Blood of Chriſt; may it not pertinently be demanded, Wherefore may not Laicks in this Age have as ſteddy hands as the Ages foregoing that Council? Or if Prieſts are the beſt Supporters of a Chalice, Why may they not hold the Cup to Peoples Heads, as well as put the Bread into their Mouths? (Not to

ſpeak

ſpeak of that Infallible Preſcience Chriſt ſeem'd to have of that imaginary Inconvenience, if we believe him to be God as well as Man.)

3. Since it is alſo one of the Reaſons aſſigned by *Gerſon*, wherefore the Council of *Conſtance* prohibited the Cup to the People, leſt the Conſecrated Wine long kept ſhould be converted into Vinegar: How can that Fear conſiſt with Tranſubſtantiation, for it is not Blood but Wine which turns into Vinegar?

4. With what Effrontory can any Romaniſt pretend, that the words of St. *John*, *chap.* 6. are to underſtood of the Euchariſt, ſince the Mutilation of that Sacrament is thereby expreſly condemned; for a Man cannot be ſaid to drink when he eats?

5. Since the Euchariſt is an Emblem of the Effuſion of Chriſt's Blood; How can they be ſaid to drink of that Cup which is the New Teſtament of Chriſt's Blood ſhed for us, who do not drink at all? Suppoſe there was Truth in Tranſubſtantiation, and in that of Concomitancy firſt deviſed by *Th. Aquinas*.

6. Since the natural Abſtemiouſneſs of ſome Men is likewiſe aſſigned as a Reaſon of that Sacrilegious Mutilation, may it not pertinently be demanded, Why is not the Bread taken away alſo, becauſe ſome Perſons have been found, who could never taſt of any kind of Bread?

7. It may be further enquired, if it were a civil Apology at an ordinary Feaſt (when there are very many invited) that the Hoſt ſhould ſay, He had provided neither Bread nor Wine, in regard one of the Gueſts cannot taſte of the former, and another cannot drink of the later?

8. Since it's impoſſible to produce one Inſtance (from any Authentick Record) for a Thouſand Years after Chriſt and more, of the Celebration of the Euchariſt in the Face of any particular Church, without giving the conſecrated Cup to all the Communicants, doth it not evidently follow, that the Catholick Church ſeem'd to have been in an Error ſo long, or that the preſent Roman Church hath degenerated from the Doctrine and Practice of the Catholick Church for ſo many Ages?

SECT. III.

Their with-holding the Scriptures from the Laicks.

Qu. 1. SInce there is no Chriſtian Church (unleſs it be a Society of Blaſphemers under the Notion of a Church) that pretends

to

to more Infallibility than Chriſt and his Apoſtles, Upon what account ſhould the *Roman* Church require more implicit Faith from its Members, than Chriſt and his Apoſtles did from their Hearers? For notwithſtanding theſe were unqueſtionably endued with an infallible Spirit, and the Gift of Miracles, yet they ſtill remitted their Hearers to the ſearch of the Old Teſtament, that they might find by their own Reaſon and Induſtry, the Doctrine of the Goſpel, conſonant to the Prophetick Oracles and Myſterious Types of our Saviour's Incarnation and Paſſion, and were commended for doing ſo.

2. If the Scriptures are ſo unintelligible, that an honeſt man cannot find out the meaning of them, without the Infallible interpretation of the Church, even in thoſe things which are indiſpenſably neceſſary to our Salvation, (for we are ſtill ready to ſay with one of the Ancient Fathers, That as they have Flats wherein a Lamb may wade, ſo they have Depths wherein an Elephant may ſwim) I would deſire to know, whether Chriſt and his Apoſtles preached intelligibly to their Hearers? If not, to what purpoſe did they preach at all? By what means were Men converted to the Faith? If they did, How came theſe Sermons to be ſo unintelligible now they are written, which were ſo intelligible when they were ſpoken? For the Goſpels contain a plain Hiſtory of what Chriſt did and ſaid; and the Apoſtles wrote the ſame things to the Churches, when they were abſent, which they preached to them when they were preſent; and we reaſonably ſuppoſe, that they deſigned that the Churches ſhould as much underſtand what they wrote, as what they preached; and therefore that they generally uſed the ſame Form of Words in their Writings, and in their Preachings; and this makes it a great Riddle, How one ſhould be very plain and eaſie to be underſtood, and the other ſignifie nothing without an Infallible Interpreter.

3. Where the *Turkiſh Alcoran* is permitted in *Engliſh*, viz. at *Rome*, (*Vid. Indic. Libr. prohibit. Alexandr.* 7.) and the Bible in *Engliſh* ordained to be burnt, (*vid. ibid.*) Whether do they fancy the Goſpel or Alcoran better?

4. Why may not an implicit Faith in the Scripture ſave a Soul, as well as in the Church; and why may not the one free from Hereſie, as well as the other?

5. Since our Saviour recommended the reading of the Scriptures to Laicks, and the Apoſtle St. *Paul* commended them for doing ſo, and that the Primitive Fathers preſſed it as a Duty on all Ranks of Perſons; Muſt not the Reaſons of the Roman Church (in prohibiting the Laicks to read the word of God, or to have the Bible tranſlated into their Mother Tongue) be exceedingly weighty, if they can preponderate all theſe Authorities?

6. Since it is well known from Eccleſiaſtical and Secular Hiſtory, that the greateſt Hereſies and Schiſms in the Chriſtian Church, and which gave it the greateſt and moſt laſting Trouble, had their Riſe from Men in Holy Orders (who were accounted great Clerks in their time) ſuch as *Marcion*, *Paulus Samoſatenus*, *Arius*, *Eunomius*, *Apollinaris*, *Macedonius*, *Photinus*, *Neſtorius*, *Eutiches*, *Pelagius*, and many others; *Novatius* alſo and *Donatius*, who rent the Catholick Church by long laſting Schiſms, were Men in Holy Orders; not to ſpeak of *Lucifer* and *Meletius*: Is it therefore a ſolid Reaſon to with hold the Scripture from the ignorant Laicks for fear of their broaching Hereſies or Schiſms, ſeeing the ſad Experience of the World doth rather teach, that the learned Clergy ſhould be reſtrained therefrom?

SECT. IV.

The Adoration of Images.

Qu. 1. DOth not the Roman Church in picturing of God not only act directly contrary to Sacred Scripture (where it is ſo frequently forbidden) but alſo to the very Nature of God, who is an infinite Spirit, and can no more be repreſented by a bodily Shape, than a Thought can? And how can their practice be re reconciled to that Canon of their Second Council of *Nice*, which determined it not only unlawfull, but alſo abſurd and impoſſible to make an Image of that Being which is ſpiritual, inviſible, and incomprehenſible?

2. If any Man can reconcile the Worſhip of Images to the Second Commandment, may it not alſo be imagined that he can make Adultery, Perjury, Murther, Theft and Falſe-witneſſing to become Vertues?

3. How can any Man that hath the uſe of Reaſon imagine, that the Antients were clear for the Worſhip of Images, ſince it is moſt apparent from the Writings of the moſt Primitive Fathers, that they all condemned the making of any kind of Image (as unlawful) much more the placing of them in Churches, and moſt of all the adoring of them?

4. Since in the *Jeruſalem Talmud* there is no mention of the Idolatry of Chriſtians (though frequently of that of the Heathen) becauſe it was written about Two Hundred Years after Chriſt: But in the *Babyloniſh Talmud*, which was compiled about Five Hundred Years after Chriſt's Nativity, there is ſcarce a Page therein, wherein they do not inveigh againſt the Idolatry of Chriſtians, and terms their Churches *Beth-havora-zada*, the Houſes of Idolatry: May we not (in conſideration of the infinite Malice of the *Jews* againſt the Chriſtian

ſtian Religion) moſt rationally conclude (tho it be from a Negative Argument) that the placing of Images in Churches began not any where during the Two Firſt Centuries, and (if we believe both Secular and Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory) not till about the End of the Fifth Century (tho they were worſhipped no where by publick Authority till after the days of *Gregory* the Great) not to ſpeak of that Canon of the Council of *Elliberis*, and that Epiſtle of *Epiphanius* (tranſlated by St. *Hierom*) which poſitively holds forth, that in the Fourth Century it was judged ſimply unlawful to have any Image in a Church, whether painted or graven.

5. May not Garlick and Onyons (the *Egyptian* Deities) be juſtly accounted God's right worſhipful, when compared with the Nails, the Thorns, the Chips, and ſhreds, and many other Objects of the Roman Adoration?

6. Since the Governing Part of the Roman Church teacheth and enjoyneth the People to worſhip Images with an inferiour kind of Adoration (as the Council of *Trent* phraſeth it) is it not (in ſome ſenſe) charitably done by them, not to let them know the Second Commandment (by expunging it out of their Catechiſms) that the People may not become guilty of ſinning againſt ſo plain a Law?

7. Since the Romiſh School-men have deviſed many Diſtinctions of Religious Worſhip, (no where to be found in ſacred Scripture) to obviate the Imputation of Idolatry to the Adorers of Images, Saints and Angels, *&c.* (ſuch as *Latria*, *Dulia*, *Hiperdulia*; a Relative and Termitive Worſhip; a Mediate and Immediate; a Direct and Indirect; a Supreme and Subordinate; a Sovereign and Subaltern; a Tranſitive and Final; a Proper and Analogical, *&c.*) May it not juſtly be demanded, if any ſober Perſon can rationally imagine, that ignorant Laicks are ſufficiently warned by theſe Beacons to ſhun the Rocks of Idolatry, when their greateſt Clerks controvert among themſelves about the proper import of thoſe Terms and the due Application of them, as is moſt evident from the contrary Sentiments of *Aquinas* and *Bellarmine*, *Vaſquez* and *Perron* concerning them?

8. Since Miracles are eſpecially neceſſary to convince Unbelievers, and that many Miracles were Recorded before the Reformation, but few or none after it; Is it not an Argumenr ſufficient to make a wary Man believe that there were few real Miracles at any time, ſince the ſettlement of Chriſtianity? And that only the Superſtitious Credulity of former Ages was apt to be abuſed with ſuch Pretences? (well-meaning Ignorance being eaſily wheedled thereby into a Golden Dream of great Advantages redounding from Adoration of Images, *&c.*) in regard that there is far more need of them ſince the Reformation (when ſo

many disbelieve the *Roman* Religion) than was before, when all the Nations of the West appeared to be at the Devotion thereof.

SECT. V.

The Invocation of Saints and Angels.

Qu. 1. WHen Romanists pray to Saints departed to pray for them, it may be pertinently inquired, that these Saints do either hear their Prayers, and become acquainted with their Desires, or they do not? If they do hear all those Prayers that are put up to them at the same time by innumerable Persons through all the World, what's this but to ascribe to them that Omnipresence and Omniscience which is peculiar to God alone; especially if it be considered, that their Devotions are not onely Verbal, but also Mental, (*Voce vel mente supplicare*, being decreed by the Council of *Trent*) yea, it is necessarily implyed in every Prayer that is made to them, that they not only hear it, but also know the disposition of the Heart, from whence it proceeds; otherwise the Hypocritical Supplicant must be supposed as likely to obtain their favours as the sincerest Votary: if they do not hear their Prayers, then it's very absurd and ridiculous, (and a great abuse of that reason God hath given Men for other ends than to trifle with) to pray to them: As for that imaginary Glass of the Trinity, it may be further demanded, if the glorified see all things therein, or but some? if all, then they must share in God's incommunicable Property, which is to be the searcher of the Heart; if but some, what assurance have we that they see those things whereof we stand most in need? so that we cannot pray in Faith.

2. Since the learned Men of the *Roman* Church (such as *Bellarmin*, *Valentia*, *Horstius*, and many others) conclude their Books with Praise to God, the blessed Virgin, and Jesus Christ; may it not be pertinently demanded, if they give her not only an equal part with God in their Praises, but by placing her before Christ, seem to give somewhat of preheminence above him?

3. Since it's acknowledged by the most part of the Popish Schoolmen, that the Invocation of Saints and Angels was not enjoined in the Old Testament, because of the *Limbo* wherein these Fathers were before Christ's Resurrection; so that not being admitted to the Beatifical Vision, they could not hear those Prayers upon Earth: It may be pertinently demanded, 1. What should have restrained the Worship of the Angels at that time, who since their Creation enjoyed that blessed Vision;

Vision; they being repreſented in the Old Teſtament as the conſtant Attendants and Retinue of God, and the great Miniſters of his Providence, and therefore they were as capable of Divine Worſhip in the time of the Law as they are now, and it may be, a little more; for the Law it ſelf was given by the Miniſtry of Angels, and their Appearances were more frequent and familiar; and the World ſeemed to be more under the government of Angels then, than it is now, ſince Chriſt is made the Head of the Church, and exalted above all Principalities and Powers? 2. What Evaſion can they find, who are of opinion, that the glorified Saints at all times did know the Petitions put up to them from Earth, not by the beatifical Viſion, but by ſpecial Divine Revelation? 3. Since the generality of the Fathers of the three firſt Centuries were of Opinion, that the glorified Saints ſhall not enjoy the Beatifical Viſion till the day of Judgment, it may be pertinently enquired, if theſe Fathers practiſed or believed the neceſſity, or expediency of Saint-Invocation; no fewer than Eighteen of the Fathers, being of this Opinion, by the Romaniſts own confeſſion?

4. What is more in the *Apoſtrophe* of *Greg. Nazianz.* to his Siſter *Gorgonia*, or S. *Jerom* to his devout *Paula*, and S. *Auguſtin* to his Mother *Monica*; than in theſe *Apoſtrophes* frequently found in Sacred Writings to inſenſate Creatures; *Hear O ye Mountains the Lord's Controverſie: Praiſe the Lord ye Dragons, and all Deeps*, &c. And who will infer from hence, that the inſenſate Creatures were hereby invok'd and addreſſed unto; yet we muſt carefully diſtinguiſh betwixt the Speeches of ſome particular Fathers, and the general Doctrine of the Church, betwixt what they expreſs in Rhetorical Strains to move Affection, and what they lay down in plain terms to inform the Judgment: betwixt what reſults from the heat of their popular Orations, and what in cool and deliberate Debates they ſet down for the Truth of Chriſt; for it's generally confeſt, that the Fathers oft times hyperbolize, particularly St. *Chryſoſtome*; and we muſt not take their flights of Fancy for the Doctrine of the Church.

5. If theſe words, *Matth.* 4. 10. taken out of *Deut.* 6. 13. *Him only ſhalt thou ſerve*; are to be underſtood only of the higheſt degree of Religious Worſhip as a part of the whole, and diſtinguiſh'd from a lower kind; this ſuperiour degree being *Latria*, and the inferiour degrees *Hyperdulia*, and *Dulia* (as the Romaniſts term them) it may be demanded, how could that have been a ſufficient Anſwer to the Devils demand? for he might thus have replied to the Son of God, I acknowledge the Soveraign and Almighty Power of God as well as you (the ſame acknowledgment being inſinuated by himſelf, St. *Luke chap.* 4. 6.) therefore I deſire not thou ſhouldſt Worſhip me as God with *Latria*, but

but only with *Dulia*, a lower kind; thy Heart, the most elevated conceptions of thy mind may be reserved to God, it's only the outward act I challenge of thee, that thou wouldst only fall down and Worship me, or by falling down, Worship me; which our Saviour simply refused notwithstanding.

6. Since the chief Argument whereby the Primitive Fathers used to prove the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, and of the Son, against the *Macedonians* and *Arians*; was the Catholick practice of the Church in praying to them: what force could have been in that argument, had they believed that any Creatures (though never so highly exalted in Nature and Condition) might have had that honour paid unto them?

7. Since the Catholicks did frequently accuse the *Arians* of Idolatry, for praying unto Christ (whom they conceived to be no more than an excellent and good-like Creature) had the Catholicks at the same time practised the Invocation of Saints, might not the *Arians* have returned the Charge with greater force upon themselves; for if the Chatholicks had replied as the Romanists do now, that though they did pray to the blessed Spirits, yet they did it not with that Sovereign, Direct, and final Prayer, nor with those sublimest thoughts and intentions of Honour wherewith they did address to God, but only with indirect, subaltern, and relative Prayer, and with no higher Intentions of Honour to them, than what is proportioned to the excellencies of their finite Nature: Since the *Arians* might have returned upon them with great advantage, by saying, *Sirs, With the same due Limitations we invocate the Man Jesus Christ, who* (as the Scripture assures us) *is exalted above all Angels, Principalities and Powers, and every Name which is Named in Heaven and Earth; so that tho we may not honour the Son in the same high degree as we do the Father, yet the Scripture enioyns us to do it with that same kind of honour:* Which is more than can be said in defence of that Honour and Invocation you offer to Saints and Angels.

8. Since the fancy of making the Court of Heaven resemble Princes Courts on Earth, hath brought forth that voluntary Humility of Worshiping Saints and Angels, at least this excuse of the *Romish* Supplicants, that its out of an humble sense of their own unworthiness, and an awfull regard to the infinite Majesty of God, that they address not immediately to himself, but by the Mediation of Saints and Angels these Courtiers and Favourites of Heaven; may it not be pertinently demanded, What wise Man on Earth, who is abundantly satisfied of the readiness and ability of his Prince to help him, and hath free leave given him, on any occasion, to come immediately unto him, and

is

is frequently invited for that effect) will chooſe to wave this freedom of his acceſs, and will apply himſelf to ſome inferiour Officer or Favourite to make his Addreſs? This is our caſe; God hath invited all that are in Trouble to come immediately unto himſelf, and hath frequently promiſed to grant all their requeſts who ſeek him with their whole Hearts; and hath appointed his own Son (God with himſelf) the Maſter of Requeſts, from time to time to receive all the Petitions of his Subjects; and both the one and the other are infinitely more able, and infinitely more willing to Hear and Succour them, than the beſt, the wiſeſt, and moſt powerfull of all created Beings: And ſhall we now be afraid to take that liberty which God hath given us? Shall we call that Impudence which God hath made our Duty? And whilſt we pretend Humility, ſhall we forfeit our Allegiance, and diſtruſt his Promiſes, and ſuſpect the goodneſs of his Nature, for fear of being found too ſaucy, and too bold with his Perſon?

9. Since *Deut.* 13. we are expreſly forbidden to hearken to any Prophet, though a Worker of Miracles, who teacheth the Worſhip of any other Being beſide the one Supreme God; may it not pertinently be demanded, if Chriſt and his Apoſtles had taught the Worſhip of Saints and Angels, had it not been a juſt reaſon for the Unbelief of the *Jews*, notwithſtanding of all the Miracles wrought by them?

10 If ten thouſand Miracles ſhould convince a Chriſtian of the Lawfulneſs of praying to Saints departed, whilſt he hath ſuch a plain expreſs Law againſt believing all Miracles upon any ſuch account: For if ever real Miracles were wrought at the Tombs of Martyrs, it was in Teſtimony of the Truth of Chriſtianity, for which they ſuffered, not to betray any to a Superſtitious or Idolatrous Worſhip of them: though there is moſt forcible reaſon to doubt of many of thoſe pretended Miracles, if ever they were *in rerum natura*, and to fear that many of them were but Satanical Illuſions.

11. Can there be a ſolid Reaſon aſſigned why Sacrifice as well as Prayer may not be an Act of inferiour, as well as ſuperiour Worſhip, ſince the Heathens offered Sacrifice to their inferiour Demons as well as to the Supreme?

12. Since the Roman Doctors grant that the difference betwixt Supreme and Subordinate Worſhip doth not conſiſt in the outward Act, and that all the outward Acts may belong to both kinds (Sacrifice only excepted by them, which the Spirit of God notwithſtanding makes inferiour to Prayer) now it may be demanded, ſince the Law did forbid the external Acts of Worſhip without any regard to the Intention of the Worſhipper, doth it not appear from this, that this Idolatrous Worſhip was to be puniſhed with Death, *Deut.* 13? and therefore it muſt be

ſuch

ſuch external Idolatry as falls under the Recognizance of Humane Judicatures, which intention doth not, unleſs a Man had confeſſed his intention.

13. When can it be ſhewn that thoſe Fathers (whoſe Authority is urged by the Church of *Rome* for the Invocation of Saints) do dogmatically and poſitively aſſert the lawfulneſs of Praying to Saints and Angels, ſince many Fathers of the ſame Age do poſitively deny the Lawfulneſs of it; is it not a plain Argument, that it was not the Judgment and Practice of the Church, and a good reaſonable Preſumption, that theſe Fathers in their Apoſtrophes and Proſopopeia's) never intended any ſuch thing in what they ſaid, how lyable ſoever their Words may be to be expounded in ſuch a ſenſe?

14. May it not eaſily be imagin'd, wherefore the late Latin Editions (in the Church of *Rome*) of the 35*th* Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*, inſtead of its prohibiting the Faithfull to call on the Name of Angels, have put in *Angulos* (*corners*) contrary to all the Greek Copies, and Fathers that writ them, and ſo have made nonſenſe of that excellent Canon? but *veritas non quærit Angulos*: And the miſchief of theſe Prevaricators is, that there is no reſemblance in the Greek (which is the Original Language of the Canon) betwixt the words which ſignifie Angels and Angles.

SECT. VI.

The Doctrine of Merit.

Qu. 1. IF the Doctrine of Merit of good Works (as it is taught in the *Roman* Church by an Analogy, or due proportion betwixt the Work and the Reward, as if God were unjuſt if he gave it not; but not as it imports a Reward *Virtute promiſſi Divini*, as the Fathers teach) be not perfect nonſenſe in Divinity? Since our Saviour hath expreſly ſaid, *When we have done all that we can do, we are but unprofitable Servants*; we have done nothing but what was our Duty; and the Apoſtle hath told us, That *the light Afflictions of this Life, are not worthy to be compared with that great meaſure of Glory which ſhall be revealed*: beſides that other conſideration, that all we are, and have of any goodneſs, are graciouſly derived from that inexhauſtible Fountain; ſo that neither Men nor Angels can properly Merit at the hands of God.

2. Since the Popes pretend, that they have thrown into the Treaſure of the Church, the *Superplus* of the Merits of ſome eminent Saints;

may

may it not be pertinently doubted; if they believe the foundation of that Treasure, I mean the merits of Holy Jesus to be infinit, seeing what is really infinit, can neither admit of Addition or Diminution, at least needs no Addition?

SECT. VII.

Of Purgatory.

Qu. 1. IF the Pope hath Power to take all Souls out of that imaginary Purgatory; how comes it, that he is so unmerciful, as not to rid many thousands of Poor Ones from those Flames (which are intensively no better than the torments of Hell) is it because those tormented Wretches have not Heirs and Executors behind them with Purses so flush as those of the Rich?

2. Is it possible to find an account of Indulgences in the Primitive Times, in any other sense, than that of relaxation of Penances inflicted upon scandalous Persons by the Governours of the Church?

3. Since the most Primitive Fathers by a purging Fire for Sinners, do generally understand the Fire of Conflagration in the last Day; with what face can it be pretended that they believed the Romish Purgatory, where poor Creatures suffer the Torments of Hell for a time?

4. Since the Greek Church never believed the Roman Purgatory; how can it be said with any colour of Truth, that it is a Catholick Tradition of the Universal Church, seeing the extent of the Greek Church is nothing inferiour to that of the Roman? The same Question may be proposed concerning the Pope's Supremacy, the Mutilation of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, Service in an unknown Tongue, the Celibacy of the Clergy, and many other particulars in Controversie at this time.

5. If we were to understand 1 *Cor.* 3. of Purgatory; I would demand of those Glossators, how they reconcile the Doctrine of their Prophets and Apostles, Confessours and Martyrs, the Blessed Virgin, with the Thief on the Cross, that they went immediately to Heaven, or Paradice at least; since the Apostle tells us there, that every man's Work must be tryed by Fire, of what sort it is; which note of Universality in the Eyes of a Puny Logician, comprehends the whole Race of *Adam*.

6. With what Confidence can the Roman Church boast of Antiquity in behalf of Purgatory, or Indulgences, seeing it is not able to produce any one Prayer (publick or private) nor one Indulgence, for the Delivery of any Soul out of Purgatory, in all the Primitive times, or out of their own ancient Missals or Records?

SECT. VIII.

Their Seven Sacraments.

Queſt. SInce before *Peter Lombard*'s time the number of Sacraments was indefinit in the Church of *Rome* it ſelf, if ſo be they have gathered the number of Seven from the Fathers Writings (as they pretend, for I am ſure in Scripture they find him not) it may be pertinently demanded, wherefore not ſeventy ſeven? ſeeing the Fathers call many other things Sacraments; yea, if that general Rule aſſigned by St. *Auguſtin* be obſerved in the Computation, *viz.* that all Signs, when they belong to Divine things, are called Sacraments, they would be found no ways ſhort of the greateſt number.

SECT. IX.

The Prieſt's Intention in Baptiſm.

Queſt. WHat can in reaſon be anſwered to that objection of the Biſhop of *Minori* in the Council of *Trent*, who ſaid that if they ſhould ratifie (as afterwards they moſt unhappily did) the Decree of the *Florintin Council*, concerning the neceſſity of a right Intention of the Prieſt in the Adminiſtration of Sacraments (eſpecially of Baptiſm) it would evidently follow, that it were in the Power of one ſingle Prieſt, who came to be old in Wickedneſs, to damn his whole Pariſh? Yea, ſuppoſe that Helliſh Paroxiſm did but once overtake him, that Child not rightly Baptized by him, might afterwards become a Biſhop; ſo that not only his own Ordination, but alſo all the orders conferred by him, would become invalid, which might occaſion a world of Miſchief.

SECT. X.

The Limbo of Unbaptized Infants.

Queſt. SInce many Infants are ſtill-born, and ſome dye in their Mothers Womb, all which, becauſe unbaptized, muſt go to that Limbo of Infants, according to the Doctrine of the Roman Church, where they are for ever to be deprived of the beatifical

cal Vision, which is the greatest of the Plagues of the Damned (*Pœna Damni* being in the Opinion of the Schoolmen and Fathers, much greater than *Pœna Sensus*) how can that rigid Opinion be reconciled to the infinite Goodness and Wisdom of God, to appoint a means indispensably necessary to Salvation, which in some circumstances cannot possibly be administred; and may not those cruel Opiniators be justly termed Step-fathers of Infants, as St. *Augustin* was named *Durus Pater Infantum*?

SECT. XI.

Of Transubstantiation.

Qu. 1. SInce the most eminent of the Roman School-men, such as *Scotus, Durandus. Alphonsus a Castro, Suarez, Vasques, Alliaco, Biel, Canus, Occam, Cajetan*, and *Bellarmine* himself, confess that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation cannot be evidently proved from Scripture; and that there is no absolute necessity of understanding our Saviour's Words in that Sense; may it not be pertinently demanded, is there is not a great deal of reason to understand them otherwise, seeing that strange Sense is so directly repugnant to the Senses of all that are endued with an animal Life?

2. Since there be so many parallel places in Scripture, which every man understands in a figurative, and not in a strictly literal and absurd Sense; as where the Lamb is called the Passover; Circumcision God's Covenant; the Church Christ's Body; the Rock which followed the *Israelites*, called Christ; Christ calls himself the Door, the true Vine (which the Church of *Rome* would have mightily triumphed in, if he had said, this is my true Body) wherefore may we not also understand these Words, *This is my Body*, in a Metaphorical Sense, especially considering, that it is impossible to make Sense of the whole Words of the Institution, without more Figures than one?

3. Can it rationally be presumed, that any sensible Man, who had never heard of Transubstantiation being grounded on these Words, *This is my Body*, would upon reading the Institution of the Eucharist, ever have imagined any such thing to be meant by our Saviour in these words; but rather, that this Bread signifies my Body, and this Cup my Blood, and this which ye see me now do, do ye hereafter for a Memorial of me? Far less would it have entred into any Man's Mind (not blinded with gross Error or Prejudice) to have thought that our Saviour did literally hold himself in his Hand, and did eat himself, and that

he gave away himſelf from himſelf with his own Hands; eſpecially if it be further conſidered, that our Saviour having pronounced theſe words, (*This is my Body which is broken, and my Blood which is ſhed*) before his Paſſion, this could not be true in a literal Senſe; for his Body was then unbroken and his Blood unſhed, unleſs they will ſay that Propitiation was made before Chriſt ſuffered: Nor could the Apoſtles underſtand theſe words literally, ſince they both ſaw and taſted what he gave them to be Bread and Wine; and that it was not his Body which was given, but his Body which gave that which was given: Whence any rational Man may infer, that St. *Auguſtin*'s Phraſe (in his Enarrations on the Pſalms) *Chriſtus portavit ſe manibus ſuis*, is to be underſtood figuratively, according to his own Rule for interpreting Scripture, given *Lib.* 3. *de Doctr. Chriſt. cap.* 16.

4. May not the Church of *Rome* as well conclude from 1 *Cor.* 10. 17. that all Chriſtians are ſubſtantially changed into one Bread, and then into the natural Body of Chriſt, by the participation of the Sacrament, becauſe they are ſaid to be one Bread, and one Body, as to infer Tranſubſtantiation from the Verſe immediately foregoing, or from any other place of Scripture?

5. Suppoſe *Juſtin Martyr*, (who lived, *An.* 159.) *Ireneus*, (who lived *An.* 180.) *Tertullian*, (who lived, *An.* 206.) *Origen*, (who lived, *An.* 230.) St. *Cyprian*, who lived, *An.* 250.) *Theodoret*, (who lived, *An.* 450.) *P. Gelaſius*, (who alſo lived in the Fifth Century,) and *Facundus* the *African* Biſhop, (who lived in the Sixth) had not written any thing againſt Tranſubſtantiation (as it is ſimply impoſſible to make ſenſe of their Writings, if they believed that Doctrine) and not to ſpeak of many other Teſtimonies of St. *Auguſtin* againſt Tranſubſtantiation; I would demand if any Man in his right Wits that had believed Tranſubſtantiation, could have uttered ſuch a Teſtimony againſt it; as we find *lib.* 3. *de Doctr. Chriſt. cap.* 16. (already cited) where laying down ſeveral Rules for the right underſtanding of Scripture, he gives this for one; *If* (ſays he) *the Speech be a Precept forbidding ſome heinous Crime, or commanding us to do good, it is not figurative; but if it ſeem to command any heinous wickedneſs, or to forbid that which is profitable to others, its figurative: for Example.* Except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you; *this ſeems to command an heinous Wickedneſs, therefore its a Figure, commanding us to Communicate of the Paſſion of our Lord, and with delight and advantage to lay up in our Memory that his Fleſh was crucify'd and wounded for us.*

6. Since *Bellarmin* (*in lib. deſcript. Eccleſ. an.* 118.) tells us, that *Paſchaſius Rabertus* Abbot of *Corbey*, was the firſt who did write ſeriouſly concerning the Truth of Chriſt's Body and Blood in the Euchariſt; it may

may be demanded very pertinently, if any of the Fathers before him wrote in jeſt concerning ſuch a ſublime Myſtery?

7. Since ſome of the Fathers have as high Elegies of the Sacrament of Baptiſm, as of the Euchariſt; notwithſtanding the Popiſh Schoolmen grant there is no ſubſtantial Change made in that conſecrated Water, and yet that the Divine Bleſſing accompanying the Inſtitution, it may be effectual to the waſhing away of Sin, and Spiritual Regeneration; what reaſon can be given why the Elements of Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper may not by the ſame Divine Bleſſing accompanying this Inſtitution, make all the worthy Receivers Partakers of all the Spiritual Comfort deſigned to us thereby, without any ſubſtantial Change made in thoſe Elements, ſince our Saviour hath told us, that verily the Fleſh profiteth nothing?

8. If the *Canibals* be abhorred as Inhuman for eating the Fleſh of their Enemies, muſt it not be great Inhumanity to eat the Fleſh of a Friend, and the beſt in the World? If none can reade without horrour, the Stories of *Tereus*, *Thyeſtes*, and *Harpagus*, their eating of their own Children, (though ignorantly) how much more horrible muſt it be to feed upon the very Body of the Son of God (that was born of the Virgin) knowingly? (*Deum ſuum primo conficiunt, deinde devorant*; ſaid *Averrhoes*, juſtly deriding that prodigious Doctrine, which a little before his time began to be publickly taught in the *Roman* Church) and with what Face could the Primitive Apologiſts upbraid the Heathen with one of their Gods, who did eat his own Children, if the Chriſtians had believed at that time, that they did eat their own God? and that no ſuch thing being then objected by the Pagans to the Chriſtians, is to a Wiſe Man inſtead of a Thouſand Demonſtrations, that no ſuch Doctrine was then believed: for the Impiety and Barbarouſneſs of the thing, as it is believed and practiſed in the *Roman* Church, is not in truth extenuated, but only the appearance of it, by being done under the Species of Bread and Wine. for the thing they acknowledge is really done, and they believe, they verily Eat and Drink the Natural Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt: And ſuppoſe a man ſhould eat his Son in a Paſty (where the Figure of the Body is ſo altered, that it cannot be eaſily known to be human Fleſh; or ſo minced and aromatized, that the Taſte can no more diſcern what it is, than *Minodoe* could tell of what Ingredients the 50 Diſhes at the *Mogul's* Table were compounded, though his Curioſity led him to taſte of them all) yet if the Father know it, it can no ways excuſe him from unnatural Barbarity.

9. How can any Romaniſt aſcertain himſelf free of Idolatry, without Divine Revelation? For if Tranſubſtantiation be not true, by their

their own Confeſſion, they are certainly guilty of the moſt damnable Idolatry in the World, in Worſhipping a piece of Bread as God; and ſuppoſe ſuch a change could be, they can never be certain that it is, ſince according to the Councils of *Florence* and *Trent*, the Validity of the Conſecration depends on the Intention of the Prieſt, which cannot be known aſſuredly without Divine Revelation: neither is it ſufficient to excuſe them from Idolatry, that they intended to Worſhip God, and not a Creature; for ſo all the Idolatry that ever was in the World may be excuſed, which was nothing elſe but a miſtake of the Deity; and upon that miſtake, a Worſhipping of ſomething that was not God, as God.

10. Suppoſe a Miracle were produced to prove the Truth of Tranſubſtantiation, may it not be demanded, to what purpoſe is that production, ſeeing we cannot believe the Miracle, unleſs it be obvious to ſome of our Senſes? and then the Argument for Tranſubſtantiation, and the Objection againſt it, would juſt ballance one another: ſo that in this caſe, a Miracle would ſignifie nothing, becauſe that would be to prove to a man by ſomething that he ſees, that he does not ſee what he ſees.

11. If the Senſes of all mankind may be deluded, what Evidence have we for the Paſſion and Reſurrection of Chriſt? (Suppoſe we had ſeen them with our Eyes, and not only heard of them with our Ears) for if in the matter of Bread and Wine, all our Senſes (ſave one) are deceived, why might not one have been deluded in reference to the Humiliation and Exaltation of Chriſt; ſo that we might have as eaſily miſtaken an Image for a living man upon the Croſs, as to imagine a piece of Bread to be the true Body of a man, and that a living human Body is to be found in every Atome thereof?

12. Whereas it's ſaid in the Inſtitution, that Chriſt's Body is broken for us, and yet the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church is, that it is broken into Wholes, and not into Parts; doth not this clearly imply a Contradiction, that Chriſt's Body is broken and not broken, at the ſelf ſame time, or that it is whole and not whole?

13 Doth it not involve horrible impieties, to imagine that the glorified Body of our Saviour, ſhould be contracted to the Crum of a Wafer? That he ſhould be perfectly deprived of Senſe and Reaſon? That he ſhould not be able to defend himſelf againſt the Aſſaults of the moſt contemptible Vermin? That if the Stomach of the Communicant chance to be overcharged with Wine, that he ſhould be Vomited up again; or if he have a *Lienteria*, that he ſhould go wholly to the Draught?

14. Since

14. Since the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 10. tells us expreſly, That the Fathers did eat the ſame Spiritual Meat, and drink the ſame Spiritual Drink which we do; may it not be pertinently demanded, if the *Manna*, and Rock which followed them, were Tranſubſtantiated into the Body and Blood of Chriſt? Or may not Believers under the Goſpel, feed upon Chriſt in a Spiritual and Myſtical Senſe (as the Fathers did under the Law) without any Tranſubſtantiation of the Elements?

15. Since our Saviour, *John* 6. ſaith, *That he who Eats his Fleſh, and Drinks his Bloud, hath Eternal Life*; how can this be applied to Tranſubſtantiation, unleſs any be ſo abſurd as to imagine, That all who partake of thoſe Conſecrated Elements ſhall be ſaved?

16 Since the *Carteſian* Philoſophers have (by irrefragable Reaſons) demonſtrated, that the Nature of all real Bodies muſt needs conſiſt in extenſion, or (as they phraſe it the having *partes extra partes*; (it being ſimply impoſſible to conceive an indiviſible Atome, or leaſt particle of matter) which is laid on a plain, to touch it in all parts, but that the Superiour Portion thereof, muſt be without the contact of that plain (where there is no penetration) if therefore Chriſt's Body be reduced to an indiviſible point by Tranſubſtantiation, it may be pertinently demanded, if this Opinion doth not reduce the Body of Chriſt to the Nature of a Spirit; and conſequently, is a worſe Hereſie than the Phantaſtical Body of the *Marcionites*?

17. Since divers of the ancient Fathers improved the Doctrine of the Euchariſt in order to the Confutation of the *Eutychian* Hereſie, had it not been perfect nonſenſe in them to have avowed from ſuch a Topick (if they had believed Tranſubſtantiation) which did apparently afford a great Inſtance to the *Eutychians* againſt them?

SECT. XII.

Of the Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Maſs.

Qu. 1. SInce in a true Sacrifice, the Thing ſacrificed muſt be deſtroyed; and if it have Life it muſt be killed: it may be demanded, if Chriſt be truly and properly Sacrificed (as the Romaniſts will have it) is he not truly and properly put to Death as oft as the Prieſt ſays Maſs? which is directly contrary to *Heb.* 10. & 11. *Cap.*

2. Whereas the Apoſtle argues the perfection of Chriſt's Sacrifice above thoſe of the Law, becauſe thoſe were offered Year by Year, but the Sacrifice of Chriſt's Body was offered once for all; if Chriſt be daily Sacrificed in the Maſs, muſt not the Sacrifice of Chriſt be much more defective

defective than those of the Law; since one Sacrifice of Expiation for the whole Congregation of *Israel*, was thought sufficient for the whole Year? whereas the Sacrifice of Christ's Body is repeated every day; yea, for one single person, he may be Sacrificed a Thousand times over, if we may believe the Doctrine of that Church.

3. How could that be a Propitiatory Sacrifice at the first Institution, which was previous to Christ's Death; unless they will say, that Propitiation was made before Christ suffered: though with divers of the ancient Fathers, we are still ready to acknowledge the Eucharist to be a Commemorative Sacrifice; and it's possible, that the Error of the Romanists had its rise therefrom.

SECT. XIII.

Of private Masses.

Quest. IS it possible to reconcile the Solitary Mass (wherein the Priest Communicates alone after he hath Consecrated) to the Institution of Christ, the Practice of the Primitive Church, or with the very nature and intendment of that Sacrament; or with the *Roman* Office as it now stands; or if there can be any instance given of Solitary Masses before *Gregory* the Great dyed, which was 600 years after Christ?

SECT. XIV.

Of the Sacrament of Penance.

Qu. 1. WHen *Nectarius*, with his Church of *Constantinople*, discharged for ever the Office of Penitentionaries, because of a scandalous Deacon; can it rationally be presumed, that this Office was ever reputed by them a Sacrament, but rather at the best, an Expedient to prepare men for it? for we are bound in Charity to think, that neither the Bishop, nor that Church, would have ever consented to the Abolition of a Sacrament, for the sake of such a Scandal as happened in the mis-management of it; or if they had done so, much less can it be imagined that the greatest part of the Christian Church would have concurred with them in it. Moreover, since the ancient Church had no Form of Absolution, but only the admitting Penitents to the Communion, where then shall the Form of that pretended Sacrament be found among the Ancients?

2. If

2. If the Abſolution of a *Roman* Prieſt hath the power to convert Attrition (that is, ſuch a conſternation of mind as fell upon *Judas* when he went and hanged himſelf) into the Grace of Contrition (as divers Popiſh Caſuiſts aver) had it not been an unſpeakable happineſs to that Betrayer of the beſt Maſter that ever was, to have rencountred (in the way of ſtriving) ſuch a Prieſt, when he was ſeeking after ſome Inſtrument to become *Felo de ſe*.

SECT. XV.

Of the Sacrament of Marriage, with the Clergies reſtraint there-from.

Qu. 1. IF Marriage be a Sacrament, and confer Grace, as Baptiſm and the Euchariſt; wherefore do they reſtrain their Conſecrated Perſons from that ſupernatural Quality, ſince 'tis only an Eccleſiaſtical Reſtraint they pretend unto?

2. Since God hath ſufficiently declared his Approbation of the Marriage of the Clergy, in that the whole World hath been twice (by his Appointment) Peopled by Two married Prieſts, *viz.* *Adam* and *Noah*; and that he tyed the Prieſthood under the Law, to a Race of married People; and that the Scripture hath told us, *Marriage is honourable in all*; and placeth it among the Qualifications of a Biſhop, *That he be the Husband of one Wife*, having faithful Children (not to ſpeak of that Canon of the Council of *Gangra*, nor of the Diſcourſe of *Paphnutius* in the Council of *Nice*, nor of *Spiridion*, S. *Hilary*, *Eucherius Lugdunenſis*, and many other primitive Biſhops; who were married, beſide the Apoſtle S. *Peter*:) may it not be pertinently enquired, if the Church of *Rome* borrowed their Doctrine of the unlawfulneſs of the Marriage of Prieſts, from the *Manichees*, who allowed Marriage to their Hearers (as the Church of *Rome* doth to Laicks) but forbad it to their Elect, as that Church doth to her Prieſts?

3. Had not *Æneas Sylvius* (afterward P. *Pius* the 2*d*.) good reaſon to write, that (in conſideration of the vile Abuſes of the Celibacy of the Clergy) whatever Reaſons the Clergy had at firſt to reſtrain them from Marriage, now for much better Reaſons they ought to be reſtored to that which God hath made the Privilege of all men who cannot contain?

SECT. XVI.

Of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction.

Queſt. SUppoſe the Adminiſtration of Extreme Unction to dying perſons, as a Sacrament, had been the Doctrine and Practice of the Catholick Church in all Ages (though for a thouſand years after Chriſt we find no ſuch thing) how can the Practice of the Roman Church be reconciled to the Doctrine of S. *James*, or S. *Mark* (for theſe are their Scripture-pretences) who manifeſtly ſhew us, that the deſign of that Anointing was the recovery of the patient ; (the gift of miraculous Healing not being ceaſed in the days of S. *James*) whereas the Romaniſts do not practiſe that Ceremony, till all hope of Recovery is paſt ?

SECT. XVII.

Of Tradition.

Qu. 1. OF thoſe who magnifie the Tradition of the Church ſo highly, as to imagin that the very Credit of the Scripture depends thereon, or that it gives the Scripture its Authority (which is as much as to ſay, that Man gives Authority to Gods Word) it may be demanded, What if the Church ſhould have concealed or taught otherwiſe of thoſe Writings, than as of the undoubted Oracles of God, would ſhe not have erred damnably in her Tradition ?

2. Since Tradition in the Roman Church is taken in, to ſupply the Imaginary defect of Scripture, and the Authority thereof to ſupply the defect of Tradition ; doth it not hence follow, that neither Scripture nor Tradition, ſignifie any thing without the Churches Authority ? And conſequently, it muſt needs be the Rule of their Faith ; that is, *They believe themſelves.*

3. Since the Doctrine of the Millenaries was unanimouſly received as an Apoſtolick Tradition in the 2*d* and 3*d* Centuries of the Church, meerly upon the Authority and Antiquity of *Papias*, who lived preſently after the Apoſtles ; (and yet by St. *Hierom*, and many of this preſent Age, looked upon as an Impoſture) and if both *Irenæus* for his aſſerting that our Saviour ſuffered about the Fiftieth year of his Age, and *Clem. Alexandrinus*, that he died for the Sins of the World about the Thirtieth year of his Age, are judged exceeding miſtaken, (and not

not without good ground) notwithstanding they both pretended an Apostolick Tradition, as having conversed with Apostolick Men; (*Irenæus* having written *An.* 180. and *Clemens*, 190.) And in fine, since in that famous contention about *Easter* (which miserably afflicted the Church in the days of *P. Victor*, Bishop of *Rome*, by dividing the Eastern Christians from the Western; one pretending Oral Tradition from S. *John* and S. *Philip*, and the other from S. *Peter* and S. *Paul*) may it not be pertinently demanded, What stress can be laid upon a pretence of Apostolick Tradition sixteen hundred years after Christ, (suppose it were now become Universal) but especially, when it is but the particular Tradition of a particular Church?

4. What greater certainty can be given, of the uncertainty of Oral Tradition (as it is contradistinguished from the Scripture) than this consideration, that of all Christ said (and, no doubt, he spoke much in point of Morality, which is not expressed in the Gospels) nothing is found in any Authentick Record (save the Scriptures) except that one expression preserved by S. *Hierom*, *Be thou never merry, unless thou see thy Brother living in Charity*; for which notable expression, we have the sole Authority of S. *Hierom*?

5. Since 'tis evident from the penult of S. *John*'s Gospel, at the end, as also the close of the last Chapter, *That our Saviour did many great things, which are not recorded in Holy Scripture*; is it not a great Evidence of the great incertainty of Oral Tradition, that none of all those Miracles not found in Scripture, are conveyed to us by any warrantable Record; the Legends which contain some of those pretended Miracles, being rejected as Fabulous by the best Criticks of the Roman Church.

SECT. XVIII.

Of that Thred-bare Question, Where was your Church before Luther?

Qu. 1. Of those who are still harping on that *Thred-bare Question*, *Where was your Church before* Luther? May it not as pertinently be demanded, Should a Revolt happen from the Reformed Church of *England*, to *Romanism* again (which God forbid) where was your Religion before 86, or before such a time? Would they not answer, at *Rome*, and in *England* also; only kept under, and obscured by Hereticks? And Christianity, though not so visible, yet was purer when its Professors dwelt in Mountains and Dens (places of Obscu-

rity and Privacy) in the Reigns of *Nero*, *Decius* and *Diocleſian*, than when ſome Kings were called its Nurſing Fathers, and took poſſeſſion of the ſeven Halls, as when it groaned under *Arianiſm* in the days of *Conſtantius* and *Valens*.

2. When ſome peremptorily require from us the *Æra* of all the Popiſh Errors, may it not be as pertinently demanded, when the *Acephali* began (which was ſuch a ridiculous Linſey-Wolſey Hereſie, as to be a Compound of theſe Contraries, *Neſtorianiſm* and *Eutychianiſm*, and yet gave great trouble to the Church for many years) for *Baronius* and *Bellarmin* ingenuouſly acknowledge, that they know neither the *Hereſiarch*, or the *Epocha* of the Hereſie; nor when *Filioq;* was inſerted by the Latin Church, into the Creed? And if they know not the *Æra* of their Truths, how can it be rationally expected that we ſhould deſign the preciſe times when all their Errors began, ſince 'tis in the Night-Seaſon that the Adverſary ſows his Tares in the Field of the Church?

3. It may be demanded, What more pertinency (amongſt Diſputers) is in that old *Thred-bare Queſtion*, *Where was your Church, or Religion, before* Luther? than in this amongſt Husband-men, Where was the Corn before it was weeded? For if our Fore-fathers, under the Papacy, embraced the true Faith, we have it ſtill; the Faith not being removed, but the Corruption.

4. Since the Church of *England* obligeth none to believe any thing as neceſſary to Salvation, but what is plainly proved from holy Scripture; and entirely holds the Apoſtolick, *Nicene*, and *Athanaſian* Creeds; and obeys more Canons of the firſt General Councils, than thoſe of *Rome* do; and approves that Expoſition of Scripture, which hath the conſent of the Fathers of the four firſt Centuries: Yea, holds all that the Church of *Rome* held neceſſary for Salvation, for five or ſix hundred years together. So that a Romaniſt may turn Proteſtant, without adding any Article to his Faith; but a Proteſtant cannot turn Romaniſt, without the addition of many new ones, or novel Inventions, which have neither Foundation in Scripture, nor genuin Antiquity. May it not then be moſt rationally concluded, that the Proteſtant way is the ſureſt and ſafeſt, becauſe both ſides agree therein; and that their Church was, long before Papacy appeared in the World?

5. Since 'tis impoſſible to produce any genuin Work of any of the Fathers, who lived within Four Hundred Years after Chriſt, that poſitively aſſerts the practice or the lawfulneſs of Prayer in an unknown Tongue, of taking away the Cup from the People, or with-holding the Scriptures from the Laicks, or Adoring Images, or having them

in

in Churches, the Pope's Infallibility or Supremacy, Indulgences (in the Senſe of Pope *Leo* the Tenth) the Doctrine of Merit (in the Senſe of the Council of *Trent*) that there are neither more nor leſs than Seven Sacraments, the neceſſity of the right Intention of the Prieſt for the Validity of a Sacrament, Tranſubſtantiation, the Limbo of unbaptized Infants, Private Maſſes, the Pope's depoſing Power, *&c.* may it not more pertinently be demanded of the Romaniſts, Where was Popery before *Boniface* the Third, than they can enquire of the Proteſtants, where was your Church before *Luther?*

6. Since 'tis impoſſible to find any of the Primitive Fathers (or any Chriſtian Writer, a thouſand years after Chriſt and more) who believed all the Twelve new Articles of Faith, which P. *Pius* the Fourth hath added to the Apoſtolick Creed; may it not be pertinently demanded of the Romaniſts, Where was your Faith to be found entirely before the Council of *Trent?* And is not the Modern Papacy younger by many years than *Martin Luther* himſelf?

7. Since not one of the Twelve new Articles of the Creed of P. *Pius* the Fourth is to be found in any ancient Creed, or Confeſſion of Faith generally allowed in the Chriſtian Church (whence it is evident that they are Innovations deſtitute of Primitive Authority? may we not more pertinently demand of them, Where was Papacy when thoſe Confeſſions were framed? than they can enquire of us, Where was your Church before *Luther?*

8. Since every true Reformation neceſſarily pre-ſuppoſeth Corruptions and Errors to have been before it, what Advantage can the Romaniſts have in charging our Reformation with Novelty? For if a real Reformation be made, the thing juſtifies it ſelf, and a Reformation muſt begin ſometime; and when-ever it begins, it is certainly new: Beſides, it ought to be conſidered, that this Objection of Novelty lyes againſt all Reformation whatſoever, tho never ſo neceſſary, and tho things be never ſo much amiſs: So that tho our Reformation was as late as *Luther*, our Religion is as antient as Chriſtianity it ſelf; for when the Additions which the Church of *Rome* hath made to the antient Chriſtian Faith, and their Innovations in Practice are pared off, that which remains of their Religion is ours; and this they cannot deny to be every tittle of it the ancient Chriſtianity: And what other Anſwer, I pray, could the *Jews* have given to the like Queſtion, if it had been put to them by the Ancient Idolaters of the World, Where was your Religion before *Abraham* or *Moſes?* Or what other Anſwer could the Primitive Chriſtians have given to thoſe Pagans, who pretended Venerable Antiquity and Univerſality for their Polytheiſm, but the very ſame in ſubſtance, which we now give to the Church of *Rome?* And

if

if any be so fond as to brand the Protestant Religion with Novelty, because of some negative Articles (in opposition to the Corruptions of the Roman Church, which by accident are become a part of our Faith, occasioned by their Errors) they may as well tax the Primitive Church with Novelty, because the renouncing of the Doctrines of *Arianism* at the Council of *Nice*, of *Macedonianism* at the Council of *Constantinople*, of *Nestorianism* at *Ephesus*, and of *Eutychianism* at *Calcedon*, be came a part of the Catholick Religion after the rise of those Heresies.

9. But, (to shut up this point) if to pray without Understanding, to obey without Reason, and to belive against Sense, be the surest Evidences of the Antiquity of a Church, then I pray where is that Protestant to be found, who is so contentious for Priority, as not to yield (upon these accounts) the Precedency to the Church of *Rome* above all Christian Societies in the World?

SECT. XIX.

Of the Infallibility of the Pope with his Councils.

Qu. 1. IF the Pope or Church of *Rome* be infallible, wherefore are they so uncharitable to the World (at least to their own Incorporation) as not to give an infallible Comment on Scripture, but suffers her Doctors to write as fallible Comments, and in many things as contrary to each other, as any Protestant Divines do? And I cannot imagine what good Infallibility does, if an infallible Church has no better means of understanding Scripture, than the Comments of fallible Men, that is, no better means then every fallible Church hath?

2. When the Doctors of the Roman Church vye Reasons and Arguments with us Hereticks, and dispute from Scripture and Antiquity, (especially in order to the establishing that beloved *Palladium* of their Churches Authority and Infallibility, which those cross-grain Hereticks deny) do not they appeal from the Infallibility of the present Church, to every Man's private Reason and Judgment, as much as every Protestant does? For its against the very Principles of Philosophy, to imagin that the Churches Authority can be a sufficient Topick to prove itself.

3. If a visible uninterrupted Succession be the Mark of such a true Church, as is the infallible Interpreter of Scripture (as some Romanists aver) wherefore is not the *Greek* Church an infallible Interpreter of Scripture, since she hath as visible and uninterrupted Succession from

from Christ and his Apostles to this Day, as the Church of *Rome* has? yea, if we consult the Catalogues of their Patriarchs of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, we shall not find so many Chasma's occasioned (in those Lists) by Schisms, as in the See of *Rome*.

4. Since P. *Zachary* deposed *Virgilius* Bishop of *Saltzburge*, as an Heretick, because he truly maintained, (tho in a very ignorant Age) the Doctrine of Antipodes; may it not be pertinently demanded, may not he who can mistake Truth for Heresie, also mistake Heresie for Truth? as no doubt P. *Liberius*, *Vigilius*, and *Honorius* did.

5. Since its confessed by *Bellarmine* (and divers other eminent Champions for that Church) that the Popes Canonizations are doubtful, and subject to Error; may it not be pertinently demanded, if his Infallibility should chance at any time to mistake (as I am pretty sure he hath done more than once) in what a pitiful case are the Members of that Church, who are obliged to invocate such mistaken Saints? Would not that be idolatry?

6. Since in the first and last Ages of the Church, there were many Schisms and Heresies, which (if we believe *Irenæus*, who lived in the Second Century) were as wild and extravigant as any of later date; now if the Fathers who lived in these Primitive Ages believed the Infallibility of the Roman Church at that time, may it not be pertinently demanded, Was there no prudence amongst them all in going so far about by their endeavours to bring those Hereticks and Schismaticks to the Touch-stone of the Scripture, and next to that, to the most Orthodox and Catholick Tradition? whereas how short and easie a Decision to all Debates might have been fetched hence, had they had the same Apprehension of the Authority and Efficacy thereof, by referring all Controversies depending to the determination of the Roman Church (the Mother and Mistris of all) and that infallible Conduct setled therein? But not one word of that, which makes it more than probable, that such holy and wise men knew no such thing; only when they make their Appeals to her after the express word of God, its in common with many other Churches, especially those of Apostolical Foundation, as is evident from *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and St. *Augustin*, when they had to deal with such Persons.

7. How can any rational man imagin that the Popes or Roman Councils (which they account General) are infallible, even when they are confirmed by Popes, unless Errors become Truths, and Contradictions be reconciled when determined by a Pope and Council? Since P. *Vigilius* not only confirmed the Fifth General Council, which formerly he had condemned, but General Councils confirmed by Popes have made Definitions and Decrees plainly contradictory one to another: Thus th

the Sixth General Council confirmed by Pope *Adrian* the Firſt, defined that Marriage was diſſolved by Hereſie: And the Council of *Trent*, confirmed by P. *Pius* the Fourth, that it could not be ſo: The Council of *Conſtance*, confirmed by Pope *Martin* the Fifth, decreed, that a General Council was ſuperiour to the Pope: The laſt *Lateran* Council, under P. *Leo* the Tenth, condemned this Decree; ſo did it the Decree of P. *Nicholas* the Fifth, who ratified the Council of *Baſil*, as a true General Council.

8. How can any doubt that General Councils confirmed by Popes, may err? ſince it is ſo manifeſt they have actually erred, by making Decrees ſo apparently contradictory to the Plain Words and Senſe of Holy Scripture, that no impartial Perſon can any more queſtion it, than he can, whether Theft be forbidden by the Eighth Commandment: So did the Council of *Conſtance*, confirmed by P. *Martin* the Fifth, and *Trent*, by P. *Pius* the Fourth, the former in the Decree for Laicks Communicating in one kind only, nowithſtanding (as themſelves acknowledge) that Chriſt inſtituted the Sacrament in both kinds, and delivered it in both to his Diſciples: The latter in decreeing, that Divine Service ſhould not be in the Vulgar Tongue, in plain contradiction to what St. *Paul* preſcribes in 1 *Cor.* 14. not to ſpeak that the Pope's Confirmation of Doctrinal Definitions, is but a meer Ceremony; it being impoſſible for any man to make that become true, which is falſe; or that which is falſe, to become true.

9. Since from the fitneſs of an infallible viſible Judge for the Militant Church, the Romaniſts are apt to pretend that God hath actually appointed ſuch an one, without which, God (ſay they) had not made ſufficient Proviſions for the aſſurance of Man's Faith, and for the Peace and Unity of his Church (or, as it is with a ſtrange kind of Civility expreſſed in their Canon Law, *Aliter Dominus non videretur fuiſſe diſcretus*, otherwiſe our Lord had not ſeem'd to be diſcreet) may it not be very pertinently urged from this Topick of Humane Appearance, that it had been yet more uſeful for the Church, that not only the firſt Patriarch, but all of them, had been infallible; yea, and all the Biſhops, and Presbyters of the Church; and if all men had been infallible, certainly the Church of God would never have been troubled with any Error whatſoever, but the experience of the World demonſtrates that it is not ſo.

10. If it be a fit Argument always to conclude that God hath done ſuch a thing, becauſe the generality of Men judge it expedient to be done; may it not be pertinently demanded, where is that man, who, conſulting with Fleſh and Blood (I mean humane Reaſon) who would not have thought it very fit, that our Saviour, after his Reſurrection, ſhould

ſhould have publickly taught the People of *Hieruſalem* in the Temple, as he uſed to do, that all the Inhabitants of that great City, (yea, all the Males throughout the Land being obliged to be there alſo at the Feaſt of the Paſſover) might by an ocular Demonſtration be convinced that our Saviour was not an Impoſtor, when he ſaid he would riſe again the third day? yet the infinite Wiſdom thought it not fit, *For his ways are not as our ways, nor his thoughts as our thoughts*, Iſa. 55. 8, 9.

11. Since it is no leſs behooffful for the Purity of the Militant Church, to be ſecured from Vice, than from Error, by ſome infallible means; and whereas the former is not pretended to by any, is it not very reaſonable to put the Romaniſts to it, to ſhew from Scripture who this Infallible Viſible Judge is who is inveſted with that Power, or Commiſſion; eſpecially when it is conſidered that our Judge of Controverſies in the Church is now become our greateſt Controverſie? Beſides that, it would puzzle any man to give a good reaſon why God ſhould take more care to ſecure men againſt Errors in Belief, than againſt Sin and Wickedneſs in their Lives.

12. If an infallible viſible Judge be ſuch an adequate means to determin all Controverſies in matters of Religion, which happen in the Militant Church, (as the Romaniſts pretend) how came it to paſs that there were ſo many Schiſms and Hereſies too in the Apoſtles times, when thoſe who govern'd the Church were certainly guided by an Infallible Spirit?

13. Can the fierceſt Bigot of Popery prove from Holy Scripture, that the Pope is infallible (in the Popiſh Senſe of the World?) I know that ſome fly the Abſurdity, by hiding the Pope in the Church; but if the Church be Infallible, it is ſo as its repreſentative in General Councils, or diffuſive in the whole Body of Chriſtians; and then what is Infallibility to the Church of *Rome*, more than to any other particular Church? And how ſhall that which is common to all, give power to one over all? And what is it to the Pope above another Biſhop or Patriarch?

14. Since the Council of *Trent* hath determined that Infants ſhould not be Communicated, becauſe they cannot examine themſelves, nor diſcern the Lord's Body; who can doubt but that Popes, with their Councils, and Roman Church, have erred in their Belief and Practice of the Communion of Infants long ago, it being paſt all doubt that for ſome Hundreds of Years it was ſo in the Roman Church?

15. Was not the Apoſtle to blame, to ſay there muſt be Hereſies and Diviſions among you, and not to tell them, there muſt be alſo an infallible Judge among you to obviate ſuch pertinacious Errors and Schiſms, if ſo be that God had appointed any ſuch infallible viſible Judge be to for ever in his Church?

16. If the many Diſſentions in the Proteſtant Churches (as is pretended) make this infallible viſible Judge always neceſſary, how is it that this ſole Remedy is found ſo ineffectual againſt the Diviſions in the Roman Church, and that there are ſo many Differences there about Infallibility it ſelf, the manner and ſubject of it? ſo that many Romaniſts (not of the dulleſt brains) being aſhamed of it, have betaken themſelves to Tradition inſtead thereof.

SECT. XX.

Of the Pope's *Supremacy.*

Qu. 1. SInce the Reaſon aſſigned by the Council of *Calcedon*, giving equal Priviledges to the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* with him of *Rome*, is becauſe old *Bizantium* was become *Nova Roma*, that is, the Emperours had fixed their Habitations there; might not *Milan* and *Ravenna* have claimed the ſame Priviledge, ſeeing ſome Emperours did honour thoſe Cities with their Preſence many years?

2. Had not the *African* Churches as good reaſon to decline the pretended Authority of the Biſhops of *Rome*, as the Churches of *Cyprus* to reject the Juriſdiction of the Patriarch of *Antioch* (from which liberated at laſt by the Third General Council) ſince they had ſtill a Primat of their own; and were no more within the Roman Patriarchat, than *Cyprus* was within that of *Antioch*?

3. Since all ſober Perſons *hinc inde*, acknowledg a Primacy of Order in St. *Peter* (either for his Age, or his being firſt called to be an Apoſtle, or for his Zeal, or ſome other reaſon beſt known to his Lord and Maſter) it being impoſſible that any Society ſhould remain long without Confuſion (far leſs that it ſhould continue well ordered) which hath not one appointed to be the Mouth thereof; it may therefore be pertinently demanded if any Romaniſt can produce any place of Scripture which imports a formal Juriſdiction in St. *Peter*, which was not at ſome other time vouchſafed on the Catholick Church, at leaſt on the reſt of the Apoſtles?

4. *Dato ſed non conceſſo*, that St. *Peter* had a Primacy of Juriſdiction over all the General Members of the Catholick Church; wherefore might not this have been a perſonal Priviledge and intranſmiſſible to any Succeſſor, no leſs than the *Gradus Moſaicus* was to any other Prophet?

5. Upon what Grounds do *Bellarmin* and others call Chriſt's Ingemination of theſe Words, *Feed my Sheep*, the peculiar Priviledge of St. *Peter*, above all the reſt of the Apoſtles, ſince St. *Auguſtin*, and St. *Cyril*

rit of *Alexandria* call it the peculiar Penance of St. *Peter* for denying his Lord and Maſter, which none of the reſt had done?

6. Since the Primitive Fathers by Rock in the 16th. of St. *Matthew*, generally underſtand either Chriſt himſelf, or that excellent Confeſſion of St. *Peter*, where then doth his peculiar Prerogative lye in theſe Words?

7. Suppoſe our Saviour did mean by St. *Peter*, when he ſaid, *On this Rock will I build my Church*, (alluding to his Name by way of Emphaſis, not Excluſion) I pray, where is yet the peculiarity of St. *Peter*'s Priviledge, ſince if we believe either St. *Paul*, or St. *John* in his Revelation, the reſt of the Apoſtles were Foundations as well as he? for I hope none will call him the *Chief Corner-ſtone*.

8. Since the generality of the ancient Fathers look upon *Peter* (both in his Excellent Confeſſion, and Promiſe made to him, as perſonating the Catholick Church) and that what our Saviour there promiſed, was after his Reſurrection fulfilled, as we may read, *John* 20. 21, 22, 23. Where, I pray you, is St. *Peter*'s ſpecial Priviledge above the reſt of the Apoſtles, ſince our Saviour ſaid to them all alike, *As my Father ſent me, ſo ſend I you*: (and I ſuppoſe S. *Peter* could not have a Sublimer Miſſion than our Saviour) and breathed upon them all, and ſaid, *Receive ye the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe Sins ye remit*, &c.

9. But what ever Senſe theſe Words of St. *John* may have, or theſe of St. *Matthew*, doth it not evidently appear, that what our Saviour promiſed to St. *Peter*, *Matth.* 16. was given to the Catholick Church, at leaſt to the reſt of the Apoſtles as well as *Peter*, in *Matth.* 18. 18. in the ſame words of *Mat.* 16. our Saviour himſelf having expounded the Power of the Keys, by that of Binding and looſing?

10. Since after that Promiſe made to St. *Peter*, *Mat.* 18. we find the Apoſtles (more than once) controverting for Superiority; may it not very rationally be preſumed that H. Jeſus (the Wiſdom of the Father and Prince of Peace) having taken notice of that Ambitious Debate, would once have undeceived them, by telling them, that tho the Deſpotical Power of the Gentile Kings or Governours ſhould be far removed from them, yet their minds ſhould be at reſt, becauſe he had already inveſted St. *Peter* with a Paternal Authority or Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction over them, when he promiſed to him the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; but ſince in our Saviour's reproof we find no ſuch Inſinuation, may it not be pertinently doubted if ever he meant any ſuch matter?

11. I would demand, how the enſuing particulars can be reconciled to a formal Juriſdiction of S. *Peter* over the reſt of the Apoſtles, 1. The Care of all the Churches being committed to every one of them *in ſoli-*

dum. 2. St. *Peter* was ſent by the Apoſtles and Elders at *Hieruſalem* to *Samaria* (he that gave the Commiſſion having rather the Authority, than the Perſon commiſſionated.) 3. His being called to an account for converſing with *Cornelius* the Centurion in *Cæſaria*, and other Gentiles, by thoſe at *Hieruſalem*, *velut vehementur infenſi* (as S. *Chryſoſtom* phraſeth it.) 4. If St. *Peter* was then Supreme Governour, wherefore did not the controverting Chriſtians at *Antioch* addreſs firſt to him in order to the indicting of a Council? 5. Wherefore did St. *James* preſide therein, and by his Verdict determine the Controverſie (if we believe *Euſebius* and *Epiphanius*) and not St. *Peter*, on which account, and becauſe he was the firſt Biſhop of *Hieruſalem*, and of the Chriſtian World, *Epiphanius* poſitively aſſerts that St. *James* was inveſted by our Saviour with a Superiority over all the Apoſtles. 6. Wherefore was not that Decree iſſued forth in the Name of *Peter*, if he was the Monarch of the Church? 7. Why was St. *Paul* ſo immethodical to reckon *James* before *Cephas* or *Peter*; and ſo arrogant as to ſay, that he was, in nothing, inferiour to the chiefeſt Apoſtles (for if St. *Peter* was his Superiour, he came ſhort of him in ſomething, which is very material, and that is Authority.) 8. Was not St. *Paul* a very unmannerly Vaſſal to rebuke his Lord and Maſter for Judaizing; and ſo ſolemnly, that both Jews and Gentiles were witneſs to the Reproof? 9. How could St. *Cyprian* ſay that the reſt of the Apoſtles were the ſame that St. *Peter* was, *pari conſortio præditi honoris & poteſtatis*? Finally, How could *Euſebius* aver (in his Old Editions, before they ſuffered the *Index Expurgatorius*) that *Peter*, *James*, and *John* were appointed Princes of the Apoſtles, and that theſe three were equal?

2. Since P. *Leo* the Tenth, with the conſent and approbation of the *Lateran* Council (which they account General) declares that our Bleſſed Saviour did inſtitute St. *Peter* (and his Succeſſors in the Roman See) his Vicars, to whom, by the Teſtimony of the Book of Kings, it was ſo neceſſary to yield Obedience, that whoſoever would not, was puniſhed with Death: (thus *Binius Concil. Tom.* 9.) it may be pertinently demanded, if they have Five Books of Kings, for in the Vulgar Verſion (which have four of that name) there is not one Syllable which inſinuates any ſuch matter?

13. If the Biſhop of *Rome* was inveſted *Jure Divino*, with an univerſal Juriſdiction over the Catholick Church; or if the Roman Church, either in its Head or Members, ſeverally, or in all conjunctly, be indued with an infallible Spirit; how comes it to paſs that all the antient Apologiſts were guilty of ſuch a Supine Negligence (from *Juſtin Martyr*, the firſt of them, who lived, *Anno* 150. to *Theodoret* inclusively, who dyed about the middle of the Fifth Century) as never to mention

tion that moſt admirable Prerogative of the Roman Church above all the Societies in the World, ſince ſome of them deſcend to many minute Particulars, which are long ago obſolete and out of date in all the *Churches* of *Chriſt* ?

14. If it be a ſufficient Anſwer for the Silence of the Apologiſts, to ſay, that they are ſo ſuccinct, that they had no room for ſuch a matter ? For though it is eaſily granted, that of *Aſianus*, *Melito*, *Quadratus*, and *Ariſtides*, we have but Shreds in *Euſebius*; and that *Athenagoras*, *Tatian*, *Theophilus*, *Antiochenus*, *Minutius Fœlix*, *Cyprian ad Demetrianum*, *J. Firmicus Maternus*, are very brief; not to ſpeak of many Orations written by the Fathers againſt *Julian* the Apoſtate, the Jews and Gentiles in general (which are alſo reckoned among the Apologiſts, and are yet briefer) yet the two Apologies of *Juſtin Martyr*, with his Dialogue with *Tryphon* the Jew, all the Works of *Clem. Alexandrinus*, ſave his *Pædagogus*, the larger Apologetick of *Tertullian*, with his leſſer *ad Scapulam*, and ſome Books againſt the Jews and Gentiles, the eight Books of *Origen* againſt *Celſus*, the ſeven Books of *Arnobius contra Gentes*, and ſo many of *Lactantius* his Inſtitutions, *Euſebius de demonſtratione & præparatione Evangelica*, *S. Auguſtin* his 22 Books *de Civitate Dei*, *Theodoret* his 12 Books *de curandis Græcorum affectibus*; all theſe are pretty Voluminous: yet *negru quidem*, not the leaſt word or inſinuation of any ſuch prodigious privilege of the Roman Church, either in its Head or Members.

15. What greater Elogy could have been given by any of the Fathers to S. *Peter*, than that which S. *Chryſoſtom* applies to S. *Paul*, that he was the Light of all the Churches, the Foundation of the Faith, the Pillar and Ground of Truth ?

16. Might not the Biſhop of *Antioch* have claimed by virtue of Succeſſion, a Superiority over all the Organical Members of the Catholick Church, as well as the Biſhop of *Rome*; ſince it is certain, S. *Peter* reſided ſeven years at *Antioch*; and it cannot be proved from any Authentick Record, that he was one year at *Rome* ?

17. May not the Biſhop of *Hieruſalem* (which is the Mother of us all) with better reaſon claim an univerſal Monarchy over the Church, by virtue of Succeſſion; ſince the unqueſtionable Head of the Church dyed there ? And S. *James* the Lord's Brother, was unqueſtionably the firſt Biſhop of the Chriſtian World; whence *Epiphanius* concludes, that the Principality over the Church was due to him, and not to St. *Peter*.

18. Since its granted by *Bellarmin* and others, that St. *Peter*'s Martyrdom at *Rome* was but accidental (there being no Scripture Promiſe, or Catholick Tradition for it) can the Biſhop of *Rome*, by vir-

tue

tue of his See, pretend to S. *Peter*'s Spirit and Power, upon better grounds than *Vibius Rufus* did to the Genius of the Great *Cæsar*, because he bought his Chair?

19. Could any of the Fathers have Complemented the Bishop of *Rome* with an higher Hyperbole, than *Synesius* the Bishop of *Cyrene*, did his Patriarch *Theophilus* of *Alexandria* (none of the best of men, for he was a great Persecutor of S. *Chrysostom*) by calling his Advice a Divine Response, and an Heavenly Oracle?

20. Can any Instance be given of any Bishop of *Rome*, who before the famous Council of *Nice*, presumed to exercise any proper Act of Jurisdiction, without the proper Bounds of his own Patriarchat, called the Suburbicarian Churches, except P. *Victor*; who for attempting to Censure others without his own Precinct, was severely reprehended by *Irenæus*; and P. *Stephen*, who was justly censured by S. *Cyprian*?

21. Since to be the ultimate Object of Appeals (or *dernier besort*, as the French phrase it) is the Essential Privilege of all Monarchs, is it accountable, that the Council of *Nice* believed the Bishop of *Rome*'s Supremacy over the Catholick Church, when it determined, that all Appeals during the Intervals of general Councils, should be determined in the Provincial Synods, or by the respective Patriarchs, and that there should be no Appeal from the one to the other?

22. If the Churches of *Africa* believed the Popes Supremacy to be *jure divino*, how could 217 Bishops in the *6th.* Council of *Carthage*, (whereof S. *Austin* was one) have opposed Three Popes successively in the matter of Appeals to *Rome*; and condemned all those as Schismaticks, who did thus Appeal; and made a formal Separation of their Churches from the *Roman*, upon the account of its Illegal and Uncharitable Incroachments?

23. If that Separation was unjust, how comes S. *Augustin* to be reputed over all the Christian World, and at *Rome* too, an eminent Saint? since he died, (as the Romanists think) in actual and unrepented Schism: since S. *Augustin* denied the Popes Supremacy in matter of Appeals to *Rome*, no less than *Henry* the Eighth of *England*, might not P. *Cœlestin* as justly have Excommunicated S. *Augustin*, as P. *Paul* the Third, did *Henry* the Eighth of *England*?

24. Since by many of the Epistles of *Gregory* the Great to the Emperour *Mauricius*, and *John* the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, its apparent, that he declares all those Prelates who usurp the Titles of Oecumenical Patriarch, Universal Bishop, and Head of the Catholick Church, to be the Forerunners, or Harbangers of Antichrist; may it not be pertinently demanded, if all those Popes who from *Boniface* the Third inclusively, have affected those Titles, do not stand condemned

demned by the Judgment of their Predeceſſour as Antichriſtian?

25. If it be the Popes Prerogative (as the Romaniſts pretend) to aſſemble all the general Councils, how did it chance, that during a Thouſand years after Chriſt, and more, there was not an Oecumenical Synod in *Italy*, no not in all the Weſt (unleſs that of *Frankford* be accounted one, which was indicted by *Charlemain* againſt the Conventicle at *Nice*) and that they were very deſirous to have one in *Italy*, is moſt evident from the Letters of P. *Leo* the Firſt, (none of the meaneſt ſpirited Popes) to *Theodoſius* the Younger, his Siſter *Pulcheria*, the Emperour *Marcianus*, *Valentinian* the Third, with *Eudoxia* the Empreſs; whom he did Supplicate on his Knees, with many Tears, (thus he phraſeth it) for a Council to be holden in *Italy* againſt the *Eutychians*; but could never obtain his deſire, as to that Circumſtance.

26. If the Emperours were nothing elſe but the Popes *Mandatarij* in the indicting of Councils (as ſome term them) what could be the reaſon that P. *Vigilius*, being perſonally in *Conſtantinople*, would not Countenance the 5*th* general Council, aſſembled there by *Juſtinian* the Great, till he was haled thereto by the Authority of the Emperour, and forced to obey the Mandat of his pretended *Mandatarius*, in condemning the *tria Capitula*, which by a former Conſtitution he had approved?

27. If the confirmation of a General Council by the Pope, be ſo neceſſary, that all its Acts are invalid without it, (as ſome Romaniſts pretend) how could the Patriarchs of *Conſtantinople* be ſo irregular, as to poſſeſs the place in all ſucceeding Councils (where they were preſent) which the 2*d* and 4*th* General Councils had allotted to them, notwithſtanding of all the Proteſtations of P. *Leo* the Firſt, and his Succeſſors, againſt thoſe Council-Acts?

28. Since the Biſhops of the Primitive Church were promiſcuouſly termed Popes, (from the old Greek Word Πάππας, (which ſignifies a Father) their Epiſcopal Sees, Thrones, and Empires; and themſelves (how ſmall ſoever their Dioceſs were) were alſo called Princes (if we believe S. *Gregory Nazianzem*, and St. *Hilary* of *Poictiers*) all were termed the Succeſſors of the Apoſtles, and equal as to the intrinſic Power of Biſhops, whether it were the little Biſhoprick of *Eugubium*, compared with that of *Rome*; *Rhegium* with that of *Conſtantinople*; *Tanis* with *Alexandria*; (if we give Faith to S. *Hierom*) therefore it may pertinently be demanded, What ſolid Grounds had *Hildebrand* to Monopolize thoſe Titles to the Biſhop of *Rome*?

29. If the Romaniſts can produce any Authentick Author for the Decretal Epiſtles of all the Popes, from *Clemens* to P. *Sirvius*, (that

is

is to the middle, at the leaſt, of the *4th* Century) though they have made up a conſiderable part of the Canon Law, before *Riculfus* Archbiſhop of *Mentz*, who lived 500 years after thoſe Popes were dead.

30. Since the Belief of an Infallible Headſhip in the Biſhop of *Rome*, is with many Romaniſts, the reaſon why they receive their Articles of Faith; muſt it not then be the fundamental Article of all others? And ought it not to be the beſt atteſted by ſome plain places of Scripture; and not leave by its ſilence this ſole viſible Vicegerent of Chriſt, to the Suſpicion of bearing witneſs to himſelf?

31. Since the Pope receives his Office with an Oath, to obſerve the Apoſtolick Canons (as they are termed) with the Canons of the Eight firſt general Councils; and notwithſtanding, it is evident from the 35 and 36 Canons of the Apoſtles, (or the 33 and 34 Canons, as *Binius* hath them) that theſe are directly againſt the Popes Supremacy, as alſo the 6 and 7 Canons of the Firſt general Council; the 9, 17, and 28 Canons of the Fourth general Council: the Fifth, in condemning the Sentence of P. *Vigilius*, (in favour of the *tria Capitula*) tho he was very vehement in the cauſe: the Sixth and Seventh, in Condemning P. *Honorius* of Hereſie: the Eighth and laſt, by impoſing a Canon upon the Church of *Rome*, and challenging Obedience thereunto, (*viz.* its Condemning a Cuſtom of the Sabbath Faſt in Lent) may we not very rationally hence conclude, that the Fathers during eight hundred and ſeventy years after Chriſt, knew no ſuch thing as the Popes Supremacy by Divine Right, or any Right at all, ſeeing they oppoſed it: And that they did not believe the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*, that they had no Tradition of either that Supremacy or Infallibility, that it is in vain to plead Antiquity in the Fathers, or Councils, or Primitive Church, for either: and that the Canons of theſe eight general Councils, being the ſenſe both of the ancient and the profeſſed Faith of the preſent Church of *Rome*, the Popes Authority muſt needs ſtand Condemned by the Catholick Church at this day, by the ancient Church, and the preſent Church of *Rome* her ſelf, as ſhe holds Communion (at leaſt in Profeſſion) with the ancient? And in fine, how can the Church of *Rome* eſcape the charge of Hereſie? for he who believes the Popes Supremacy, denies in effect, the eight firſt general Councils, (at leaſt in that point) and that's Hereſie; and he who believes the Council of *Trent*, believes the Article of the Popes Supremacy; therefore he who believes the Council of *Trent*, doth not believe the eight firſt general Councils, and therefore is guilty of Hereſie: And how can any Pope evade the Brand of Schiſm, (the fouleſt that ever the Church groaned under) aggravated with the horrid Crime of Perjury; ſince the Pope (as

ſuch

ſuch) profeſſeth to believe, and ſweareth to govern the Church according to the Canons of the firſt General Councils, yet openly claims, and profeſſedly practiſeth a Power condemned by them all: thus, *quatenus* Pope, he ſtands guilty of Separation from the ancient Church; and as Head of a new and ſtrange Society, draws the Body of his Faction after him into the ſame Schiſm, in flat contradiction to the ancient Church, and to that ſolemn Oath by which alſo the Pope, as Pope, binds himſelf (at his Inauguration) to maintain the Doctrine and Practice thereof.

SECT. XXI.

Of the Pope's Depoſing Power.

Qu. 1. SInce the Fourth *Lateran* Council, under *Innocent* the Third, promiſed a Plenary Pardon of all their Sins, and a greater Degree of Glory hereafter, to thoſe who did extirpate Hereticks; if it may not be preſumed that this moſt bountiful proffer doth animate Traitors to murther their own Princes, whom *Rome* hath declared Heretical?

2. What greater reaſon is there of expounding theſe words ſpoken to *Jeremy*, (*I have ſet thee over Kings to root out, to pluck up, and deſtroy*) of the Pope's Supremacy, and Depoſing Power, (as both *Innocent* the Third, and the Canon-Law do) than had the *Donatiſts* of applying theſe words in the *Canticles*, (*Tell me, O thou whom my Soul loveth, where thou feedeſt, where thou makeſt thy Flock to reſt at Noon*) to the Flock of their Party in the Southern Country of *Africa*?

3. If any be ſo quick-ſighted as to find the Popes Univerſal Monarchy and Depoſing Power in theſe Words, *Feed my Sheep* (Heretical Princes being thoſe Wolves which are to be driven away as hurtful to the Flock) may not ſuch a *Lyncean* Eye by a like kind of Interpretation find this other Myſtery in the Words, that all Chriſtians are Fools, becauſe Sheep are ſilly Creatures?

4. Since the Doctrine of Depoſing Power in Popes (by which I mean not only their excommunicating abſolute Monarchs, but alſo the expoſing their Dominions as a juſt Prey to the firſt Invader) is ſo ſcandalous to the Chriſtian Religion in the Eyes of all ſober Romaniſts, and hath been found ſo miſchievous to many Sovereign Princes; wherefore was not that deſtructive Doctrine condemned by ſome General Council, they having had many which they account ſuch, ſince the Fourth Council of *Lateran*, under *Innocent* the Third, where

it was certainly defined, let them call it an Article of Faith, a Point of Diſcipline, or what they will.

5. Since it is evident from *Baronius*, *Binius*, *Platina*, *Onuphrius*, and many others, that *Gregory* the 7*th.* (nick-named *Hildebrand*) did excommunicate *Henry* the 4*th.* Emperor of *Germany*: P. *Paſchal* the 2*d*, *Henry* the 5*th.* *Alexander* the 3*d*, *Frederick* the 1*ſt.*. *Innocent* the 4*th*, *Frederick* the 2*d.* *Boniface* the 8*th*, *Philip* the Fair of *France*: *Julius* the 2*d*, *Lewis* the 12*th.* with him who was King of *Navarre* at that time; (on which putrid Title *Ferdinand* the Catholick ſeized on his Kingdom) and that *Alexander* the 3*d* did alſo excommunicate *Henry* the 2*d.* of *England*: And *Innocent* the 3*d*, King *John*, (Six years before the Reſignation of his Crown into the Hands of that Popes Legat;) may it not be juſtly doubted, if they who can confidently aver that never any Pope preſumed to excommunicate an abſolute Prince, did ever read thoſe Hiſtories, if ſo be they have put in Print what they did think?

6. Whether that place, 1 *Pet.* 2.13. which is quoted by P. *Innocent* the 3*d.* in his arrogant Epiſtle to the Emperor of *Conſtantinople*, doth prove that the Pope is as much greater than the Emperor, as the Sun is greater than the Moon? which ſtrange Compariſon is inſerted by *Gregory* the 9th. into the Body of the Canon-Law; and ever ſince continued in all the Editions of that Law.

7. If *Gregory* the Great imagined himſelf ſuperiour to the Emperor *Mauritius*, and not rather much his Inferiour, when he wrote to that Emperor, that in Obedience to his Commands he had publiſhed one of his Laws, which himſelf judged ſcarce agreeable to the Law of God?

8. If (according to the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*) it can properly be called Rebellion to deſiſt and dethrone a depoſed Prince, or if it can be termed true Loyalty to defend him? Since the depoſing Doctrine doth import, that when a Prince is depoſed by the Authority of their Church, they abſolve their Subjects from their Fealty; and then it is no Rebellion to take up Arms.

9. Since the depoſing Doctrine hath been decreed and practiſed by their Popes and General Councils, that no Pope or Council ſince *Gregory* the 7th. hath ever condemned it; and that the Jeſuits do ſtill maintain it, (their greateſt Champions, *Bellarmine*, *Suarez*, *Becan*, *Gretzer*, *Mariana*, *Sanctarellus*, and many others, having expreſly declared for it) yea, tho the preſent Pope (who is not the worſt of the pack) did lately cenſure ſome other Jeſuitical Doctrines (as great Immoralities) yet he thought fit to let the depoſing Doctrine eſcape without Cenſure; may we not juſtly admire how ſome of this Age have the Effrontory to out-face all Mankind (who have Eyes in their Heads,

Heads, and Skill enough to read the Decrees of their Popes and Councils) by saying that the deposing Doctrine is not the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, but of a nameless Party?

10. As for those who Found their Loyalty upon this Supposition that the deposing Doctrine is not the Doctrine of the Roman Church, doth not this Hypothesis afford a shrewd suspicion, that if it were the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, or ever should be so, or they should ever be convinced that it is so, then they would be for the deposing of Princes, no less than those, who at this day believe it to be the Doctrine thereof?

11. May it not be justly doubted, whatever some little inferiour People in Communion with the Church of *Rome* think of these Matters, while the Governing part of the Church believes otherwise, as they certainly do, at this day (if the Pope and his Adherents are the Governing Part) Princes have no security that Popes will not challenge and exercise this Authority, but their want of Power to do it, which is wholly owing to the Reformation; for till Princes had Subjects who valued not the Popes Authority, they themselves were the Popes Vassals, and must necessarily be so again, could they extinguish this pestilent Northern Heresie (as they phrase it) the great Fault of which is, that it hath given Strength and Security to Princes, by weakning the Popes Pretensions.

12. Since the Council of *Constance* owns the 4*th*. Council of *Lateran* for a General Council, *Sess*. 39. (where the deposing Power is as expresly declared as any thing can be, unless Men will quibble upon Words, and make Nonsense of them) and that *P. Martin* the 5*th*. in his Bull for the Confirmation of the Council of *Constance*, *Sess*. 45. gives the Sense of the Proposition of that Council, *Sess*. 15. may it not be very pertinently asserted, that the said Council condemns only the killing of a Tyrant, and not of an Heretick; and the killing of a Tyrant, who is not condemned and deposed, not of one who is excommunicated for Heresie; for that last Clause, without expecting the Sentence and command of a Judge, supposes that it may be a very lawful and meritorious Act to kill such Princes as are deposed by Superiour Judges, that is, by the Pope or Council; which is the only Authority that ever pretended to judge or depose Sovereign Princes; and therefore when *Suarez* was urged with this Decree, he answered, *Defens. Fidei, lib. 6. cap. 4. Where do you find in the Acts of that Council, that this extends to Princes excommunicated or deposed by the Pope?*

13. If we may take and leave of the Roman Councils what we please, and be good Catholicks still; wherefore may we not reject the Decrees of their Councils about Transubstantiation, Purgatory,

Indulgences, the Invocation of Saints, and Worſhip of Images, &c. and continue as good Catholicks as they are, who renounce the Authority of their Councils as to the depoſing Power?

14. Since P. *Paul* the 5*th*. (*Anno* 1606.) by a Breve written to the *Engliſh* Catholicks, declared and taught them, as Paſtor of their Souls, that the Oath of Allegiance, eſtabliſhed by Parliament, (3 *Jac.* 1.) cannot be taken without violating the Chriſtian Faith, and injuring the Salvation of their Souls, as containing many things which are manifeſtly contrary to Faith and Salvation: Now (as the Author of the Firſt Treatiſe againſt the Oath of Allegeance, called, The Jeſuits Loyalty, well obſerves) there are not in it (*multa*) many things to which this Cenſure is poſſibly applicable, unleſs this be one, that the Pope hath no power to diſpoſe the King, or abſolve his Subjects from the Oath of Allegiance; now when in Obedience to the Pope, the Roman Catholicks have to this day obſtinately refuſed this Oath (ſome very few excepted, who were Anathematized at *Rome* for doing ſo) is there not reaſon to ſuſpect, that they are not clear in this point? and that they who will not abjure ſo pernicious a Doctrine, may be perſwaded to practiſe it when time ſerves, and then let any man judge what ſecurity there is of their Loyalty!

15. As for thoſe Loyal Engliſh Romaniſts, who will not allow the depoſing Doctrine to be the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, tho they acknowledge it to have been decreed by Popes and Councils, becauſe all the Ages before *Gegory* the Seventh, were poſitively againſt the depoſing Doctrine, that this was a Doctrine brought in in the 11*th* Century, againſt the Judgment and Practice of Ten before, and that all the Fathers were againſt it; muſt they not needs go upon theſe Principles, 1. That Popes and Councils may, and have decreed ſuch Doctrine as are contrary to Scripture and Catholick Tradition? 2. That no good Catholick is bound to own ſuch Doctrines, though decreed by Popes and Councils? 3. That this Doctrine (although ſo decreed) is not the Doctrine of the Catholick Church? 4. That men are good Catholicks, not by adhering to the Doctrines of Popes and Councils, but to the Scriptures, expounded by Primitive and Catholick Tradition? Theſe are indeed the better Subjects, for adhering to thoſe Principles; for thoſe are the very Principles on which our Reformation is founded, and by which we juſtifie our ſelves againſt the Innovations of the Church of *Rome*: But though theſe Principles will juſtifie the Reformation, yet they will not prove, that this Depoſing Doctrine is not taught by the preſent Church of *Rome*.

16. But to ſhut up all theſe Queries concerning the vile Depoſing Doctrine, I deſire only to be informed, what Roman Catholick Nation

tion, who had all the Power in their hands, would have ſuffered a Proteſtant Prince to Succeed quietly to his Throne? We know how it fared with *Henry* the Fourth of *France*, (notwithſtanding the Parliament of *Paris*, burnt *Mariana*'s Book) and what *Henrician* Hereticks in thoſe days ſignified; but our Church teaches better; and the True Sons of the Church practiſe better; and we hope they ſhall never have reaſon to repent of what they have done.

SECT. XXII.

Of their Uncharitableneſs to all other Chriſtians.

Qu. 1. HOw can they be vindicated from Hypocriſie in a very high degree (beſide their Uncharitableneſs) who after they have Condemned an Heretick, and delivered him to the Secular Judge to be burnt, yet thus beſpeak him; *We paſſionately deſire you for the Love of God, and in regard of Piety, Mercy, and our Mediation, you would free this miſerable perſon from all danger of Death, or mutilation of Members*; How can this be reconciled to the 20 *Cap.* of the 25 *Seſſ.* of the Council of *Trent* about Reformation?

2. Since *Boniface* the Eighth hath determined, that it is indiſpenſably neceſſary for all men, to believe the Biſhop of *Rome* to be the Oecumenical Patriarch, the Univerſal Biſhop, the Viſible Head and Monarch of the Catholick Church, the Infallible Doctor of its Faith and Manners, S. *Peters* Succeſſor, and Chriſts Sole Vicar upon Earth, (which Arrogant Titles are now become a part of their Canon Law, and occur frequently in the ſixth Book of the *Decretalia*) may it not be pertinently demanded, Where was their Charity to all Chriſtians before the time of *Boniface* the Third, (who dyed in the 7*th* Century) ſeeing there is no Biſhop of *Rome* found, who did aſſume, or claim thoſe inſolent Epithets before that time?

3. What difference can be aſſigned betwixt the old Donatiſts and the preſent Romaniſts? ſince the former confined the True Church of Chriſt to *Africa*, (yea, to that Corner of it, which was *ex parte Donati*) and the later to *Rome?*

4. Let us ſuppoſe a man to walk as Conformably to the Precepts of the Goſpel, as ever any of the Sons of *Adam* (Chriſt only excepted) would it not argue the height of uncharitableneſs, to Damn that man in our Imaginations, becauſe he cannot believe the Popes Supremacy to be *jure divino*, for want of Divine Revelation; ſince the beſt Logician in the World cannot deduce it from any place of Scripture, *per decimam ſextam Conſequentiam*?

5. Be-

5. Becauſe ſome moderate Proteſtants grant, that he who is under Invincible Ignorance of the Corruptions of the Roman Church, and makes Conſcience to live up to his Light, may through the infinite Mercy of God be ſaved, (though he live and die in that Society;) hence to argue, that its beſt to joyn in Communion with the Church of *Rome*, wherein (by conſent of both parties) Salvation may be had; doth the force of that Argument, in the eyes of ſober perſons, amount to any more than this, Come over to us, for we have leſs Charity than ye; whereas a good Chriſtian (who underſtands the nature of his Holy Religion) will be ready to anſwer, I will rather ſtay in that Church which enjoys moſt of that ſupernatural Quality, which is Eſſential to Chriſtianity.

6. Becauſe a man thinks that his Neighbour (who is of a ſtrong natural Conſtitution, highly couragious, and very temperate) may be preſerved from Death in a Peſthouſe; doth it hench follow, that he believes his Neighbour is in as ſafe a condition, as he who lives at a great diſtance from any danger of Contagion?

7. If it be a ſolid Argument to comply with that Tenet, wherein both parties are agreed, wherefore doth not the Church of *Rome* embrace the Proteſtant Doctrine of Chriſts Preſence in the Euchariſt? for all ſober Chriſtians in the World acknowledge that he is really preſent, tho in a Spiritual and Myſtical manner: To this the *Romaniſts* have ſuperadded their mode of Tranſubſtantiation, and the *Lutherans* their Conſubſtantiation; therefore its ſafeſt to Acquieſce in that wherein all Diſſenting parties are agreed: the ſame may be urged as to many other particulars, even all their Superadditions to the ancient Creeds.

8. It may be further demanded, if there be any Solidity in this Topick, have not the *Cerinthians*, the *Samoſatenians*, the *Arians*, *Eunomians*, *Photinians*, and *Socinians*, the better of the Orthodox by that way of arguing, ſince it is acknowledged *hinc inde*, by all, that Chriſt was truly a man, made like to us in all things, *Sin only excepted?* but the fallacy of this Topick is ſo evident, that it is loſt labour to inſiſt any more upon it.

9. Can it conſiſt with Charity, to call thoſe Schiſmaticks, who are not *fugitivi ſed fugati*; and to Anathematize them every year (on *Manday Thurſday*) as Hereticks, who believe the whole Scriptures of God in the ſenſe of the Primitive Church; and who embrace all the Creeds of the four general Councils that were firſt in order?

10. Did not the leading party in the Council of *Trent*, diſcover themſelves to be Phyſicians of no value, and Men of no Charity, by uſing their utmoſt endeavours to perpetuate that deplorable Breach in the Viſible Church? which I account better expreſs'd in the words

words of the Hiſtory thereof, which are as followeth. *This Council, deſired and procured by Godly Men to re-unite the Church, which began to be divided, hath ſo eſtabliſhed the Schiſm, and made the Parties ſo Obſtinate, that the Diſcords are irreconcilable: and being managed by Princes for Reformation of Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline, hath cauſed the greateſt deformation that ever was ſince Chriſtianity did begin; and hoped for by the Biſhops themſelves, to regain the Epiſcopal Authority, (for the moſt part uſurped by the Pope) hath made them loſe it altogether, bringing them into much greater Servitude: on the contrary, feared and avoided by the See of* Rome *(as a potent means to moderate the Exorbitant Power thereof) mounted from ſmall beginnings, by divers degrees, to an unlimited Exceſs, it hath ſo eſtabliſhed and confirmed the ſame over that part which remained ſubject to it*, &c.

11. Since its evident from unqueſtionable Records, that the Church of *Rome* (I mean all of that perſuaſion) amounts not to the third part of Chriſtendom (if all the Proteſtants, of whatſoever denomination, the Greek Church properly ſo called, with all thoſe Chriſtians in *Aſia* and *Africa*, which are neither of the Roman nor Greek Communion, be reckoned upon) it may be demanded, with what Charity the Romaniſts monopolize to themſelves the Title of the Catholick Church?

FINIS.

Some Books lately Printed for Brab. Aylmer.

A Treatiſe of the Pope's Supremacy: to which is added, A Diſcourſe concerning the Unity of the Church. By Dr. *Iſaac Barrow.*

A Diſcourſe againſt Tranſubſtantiation. By Dr. *Tillotſon.*

A Diſcourſe concerning the Adoration of the Hoſt, as it is Taught and Practiſed in the Church of *Rome.*

A Diſcourſe of the Communion in One Kind: In Anſwer to a Treatiſe of the Biſhop of *Meaux's.*

A Diſcourſe againſt Purgatory.

An Anſwer to a Book Entituled, Reaſon and Authority: Or, the Motives of a late Proteſtant's Reconciliation to the Catholick Church. In a Letter to a Friend. Together with a Brief Account of *Auſtin* the Monk, and Converſion of the *Engliſh*, in 4°.

The Judgment of private Diſcretion in matters of Religion Defended; in a Sermon on 1 *Theſſal.* v. 21. Preached at *St. Pauls Covent-Garden*, Feb. 26. 1686. By *Richard Kidder.*

Now in the Preſs, and will ſuddenly be publiſhed,

A Diſcourſe of the Sacrifice of the Maſs, in 4°.